PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

2694

Number 25 **1927**

Parliaments and Foreign Affairs — *W. E. Lingelbach*

The Menace of the Mediterranean — *H. C. Wendel*

The Welfare of American Interests in Mexico and the Caribbean Region — *W. R. Shepherd*

The New World History — *J. M. Gambrill*

MEETINGS

PHILADELPHIA ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

Number 25 **1927**

Parliaments and Foreign Affairs — *W. E. Lingelbach*

The Menace of the Mediterranean — *H. C. Wendel*

The Welfare of American Interests in Mexico and the Caribbean Region — *W. R. Shepherd*

The New World History — *J. M. Gambrill*

MEETINGS

PHILADELPHIA ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

CONTENTS

PAGE

PHILADELPHIA MEETING, APRIL, 1927 1

I. Parliaments and Foreign Affairs, *Professor William E. Lingelbach* 2

II. The Menace of the Mediterranean, *Professor Hugo C. Wendel* 29

III. The Welfare of American Interests in Mexico and the Caribbean, *Professor William R. Shepherd* 40

IV. The New World History, *Professor J. Montgomery Gambrill* 51

V. Content of World History, *Dr. Alexander C. Flick* 59

ATLANTIC CITY MEETING 68

VI. Phases of Fascism, *Professor Herbert W. Schneider* 69

VII. Biography and The Teaching of History, *Roy F. Nichols* 85

VIII. The Courting of Dobroi Ivan, *Professor Dobroi Ivan* 92

IX. Report of Membership Committee, *Kathryne C. Carrigan* 105

X. In Memory of Lucy Maynard Salmon 106

XI. Treasurer's Report 109

XII. Report of Membership Committee 100

XIII. Constitute 111

XIV. Subscribing Libraries 113

XV. The Council and Membership List 115

77248

CONTENTS

PAGE

PHILADELPHIA MEETING, APRIL, 1927 1

I. Parliaments and Foreign Affairs, Professor William E. Lingelbach 2

II. The Menace of the Mediterranean, Professor Hugo C. Wendel 29

III. The Welfare of American Interests in Mexico and the Caribbean, Professor William R. Shepherd 40

IV. The New World History, Professor J. Montgomery Gambrill 51

V. Content of World History, Dr. Alexander C. Flick 59

ATLANTIC CITY MEETING 68

VI. Phases of Fascism, Professor Herbert W. Schneider 69

VII. Biography and The Teaching of History, Roy F. Nichols 85

VIII. The Courting of Dobroi Ivan, Professor Dobroi Ivan .. 92

IX. Report of Membership Committee, Kathryne C. Curry 105

X. In Memory of Lucy Maynard Salmon 106

XI. Treasurer's Report 109

XII. Report of Membership Committee 100

XIII. Constitute 111

XIV. Subscribing Libraries 113

XV. The Council and Membership List 115

PHILADELPHIA MEETING

April 1-2, 1927

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, THE OLD CHAPEL

Friday Afternoon, April 1, 3:00 o'clock.

GENERAL TOPIC—*"European Conditions and Problems."*

a. *"Parliaments and Foreign Affairs,"* Professor William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania.

b. *"The Menace of the Mediterranean,"* Professor Hugo C. Wendel, New York University.

c. *"Making Russia Communistic,"* Mr. William C. White, Friends School, Wilmington, Delaware.

Friday Evening, April 1, 8:00 o'clock.

GENERAL TOPIC—*"Central America and Mexico."*

a. *"The Welfare of American Interests in Mexico and the Caribbean Region,"* Professor William R. Shepherd, Columbia University.

b. *"Our Investments in Latin America,"* Professor Harry T. Collings, University of Pennsylvania.

Saturday Morning, April 2, 9 o'clock.

GENERAL TOPIC—*"New World History."*

a. *"The New World History,"* Professor J. Montgomery Gambrill, Teachers College, Columbia University.

b. *"The Content of World-History Courses in School and Colleges,"* Dr. A. C. Flick, State Historian, New York.

THE CONTROL OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY*

The control of foreign affairs is still the Achilles heel of democracy. Democracy, it has been well said, calls for the fullest participation of the people in every important act of the government. This demands publicity, discussion and action by legislative bodies. Diplomacy, on the other hand, calls for secrecy and large discretionary powers on the part of executive agents[1]. Efforts to establish adequate legislative control have thus far failed even in the most democratic of the great powers. Possibly the League of Nations and the safeguards incorporated in the constitutions of the new governments of the post war period will lead the way to a more satisfactory solution of this difficult problem.

The significance as well as the necessity of moving in this direction can no longer be questioned. The control and direction of foreign affairs has become the most serious question of modern governments, surpassing in importance most other problems of our time. Science and investigation are fast eliminating distance and time, destroying physical barriers and bringing the nations of the world together. Peoples formerly remote from each other are today near neighbors, interdependent in their political, economic, financial, intellectual and even social life. Till the World War the United States still regarded itself as separate and independent of the affairs of Europe and the rest of the world. The war and the developments of the post war years have impressed upon all thoughtful persons that this is true no longer.

---

*This address is based on a paper read at the Bicentenary Meeting(1927 of the American Philosophical Society.

[1]For the discussion of the general phases of this subject see Bryce, Viscount James, *Modern Democracies* Vol. II, pp. 358-84, (1927 edition); J. Holland Rose, *The Rise and Growth of Democracy in Great Britain;* A. Ponsonby, *Democracy and Diplomacy,* and *Parliaments and Foreign Affairs* by the same author; D. P. Heatley, *Diplomacy and the Study of International Relations;* J. Barthelmy, *Démocratic et la politique étrangèr* and, Sir Harry Johnston, *Common Sense in Foreign Policy.* Works on the control of foreign affairs in our country, are cited below— p.—

Our national isolation is a thing of the past. Not only are we very much nearer the other peoples of the world but we are rapidly becoming vitally interested in their economic welfare. From a debtor nation we have become the greatest creditor nation of history. We are exporting, and will continue to export, capital by the millions. We invest it in the national and municipal enterprises of other countries, building up, as it were, an invisible empire, which has already brought in its train a direct and very concrete interest in the affairs of these countries. The enormous sums thus invested, added to our commercial interests, are given a new and much more active and aggressive orientation to our foreign policy. Great banking houses representing the interests of thousands of investors are vastly more powerful in international affairs than many of the so-called sovereign states. The foreign relations of our country, like those of other large powers, are attaining an importance not only vastly greater than at any other period in history but they are taking on the peculiar characteristics of the modern capitalistic state. The question of the direction and control of foreign relations can therefore not be easily over emphasized. It is therefore of the utmost importance that democracies submit acts of their respective Foreign Offices to popular control.

Before the World War the practice in nearly every country placed the actual control and management of foreign affairs in the hands of the foreign minister without adequate provision for his accountability. As a result the foreign policies of most European countries were usually shaped by a small junta or camarilla, composed of the foreign minister, one or two fellow cabinet members, and at times the Monarch, with one or two representatives of the military, commerce and high finance.

Not only did they keep the people and parliament in ignorance but they frequently deceived them in order to win support for their policies. They made alliances in secret, spun webs of diplomatic intrigue and then, caught in the vicious systems they had themselves created, frightened colleagues and people into ever-increasing expenditures for armies and navies till the inevitable crash came in the World War. Selfish and braggadocio leaders and rulers blundered into the great disaster. But incredible as it may seem, the principal nations are still conducting their foreign rela-

tions much as before. Today, after the experience of the most terrible war in history and the menace of scientific warfare in the future, secret diplomacy, and an inexplicable fear of substituting co-operation and law for anarchy and war in international relation still prevails.

Speaking of the control of foreign affairs in England before the World War, Lord Curzon said, "Parliament knows little and the public knows less of what is going on." Treaties are negotiated and signed without the knowledge or consent of the Commons and often remain secret for a long time. In France there are certain constitutional checks but they are not very effective, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies rarely asserts itself against the Quai d'Orsay. Just before the World War, the socialist leader, Jaurès, protested against the arbitrary conduct of the foreign minister. "It is a crime," he said, "that treaties and obligations between the Republic and other states exist, which may involve it in a war, but of which the Deputies are in entire ignorance." In Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia autocratic direction of foreign affairs pertained into the years of the war. There was no democratic control. In the United States we are in the habit of pointing to our system of checks and balances and to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as evidence of congressional control and direction of our foreign relations. But when all is said and done, how much influence does it exercise in shaping and carrying out international policies? Our constitution provided for the democratic control of foreign relations a century before Great Britain and other powers did so, but in recent years, critics of our system claim, there is a dangerous tendency toward autocracy in this department of our government.

The anomalous character of this situation had attracted the attention of scholars and statesmen for some years before the World War. During, and following, the great disaster, the subject assumed a new and unique importance. This was due, first, to the appalling consequences resulting from the mismanagement of foreign affairs, second, to the establishment of the League of Nations, and third, to the unexpected and altogether unprecedented revelations of the secret diplomatic archives of the pre-war period.

Heretofore the records of the diplomatic history of all important countries were kept under lock and key for more than half a century after the events. It was impossible for the people to know what had been done. There was no opportunity to profit by past experience because the knowledge of the past could not be obtained. Most of the histories of international relations written during the century following the events had to be based on the meagre evidence the different foreign offices vouchsafed to publish, and upon private memoirs, correspondence and diaries. Parliaments and people were kept in ignorance not only of what was being done but of what had been done. A veil of secrecy was spread over the past, as well as the present.

With the outbreak of the World War the belligerents all hastened to appeal to public opinion by publishing what purported to be the documents revealing their pre-war policies. At the time they were popularly referred to as "The Evidence in the Case". In a last analysis, however, these documents known as the "Colored Books" did not give the evidence in the case, but rather such evidence as each particular government considered best suited to establish its case. In other words, they partook somewhat of the nature of briefs. Indeed some went so far in this direction that they did not stop short of distorting and falsifying the documents. All are marred somewhat on this score, but the most flagrant case is that of the Russian Orange Book.[2] Plainly the world was not given the whole truth, often anything but the truth, in this official propaganda. Not till the war was over did new and less partisan evidence appear.

The first revelations came from Soviet Russia. In a remarkable series of volumes, still in process of publication, the objectives and methods of Tsarists diplomacy are being revealed. The documents, ably edited by Professor E. A. Adamov, Director of the Archives of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, are of fascinating interest and importance in the history of European diplomacy. The two volumes on Constantinople and the Straits, reveal with

[2]Cp. Romberg, Baron G von, *Falsifications of the Russian Orange Book*, N. Y. 1923; also a later and much more elaborate study by Wagner, A von, *Das Russische Orangenbuch von 1914*. This contains 208 documents as against 79 in the original.

startling clearness the objectives of Russian diplomacy in the Near East, especially the ever recurring Byzantine dream of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great with respect to Constantinople. To attain this objective the Tsarist government pressed for and obtained the support of France, negotiated the Racconigi agreement with Italy and developed a policy in the Balkans which became progressively clearer and more aggressive.

The mere titles of the volume thus far published suggest the value of the materials they contain for the student of European international relations before the World War.[3] The first volume to appear is entitled *A collection of secret documents from the archives of the former minister of Foreign Affairs.* The second is on *The European powers and Greece during the World War*, and the third on *The European powers and Turkey during the World War.* In the next two are brought together the documents on *Constantinople and the Straits.*

Another series of closely related documents have been appearing in the *Krasny Archiv* (Red Archives) edited by the Central Archives of U. S. S. R.[4] The materials are varied and extremely rich, being drawn not only from the state archives, but from police and civil service records and from private sources. Only a part relate to foreign affairs, the rest to domestic matters, especially to the revolutionary movement. Of those concerned with international relations the following are of peculiar interest: Volume I., *Russia-German Relations;* Volume III., *Reports of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs, S. D. Sazonov, to Nicolas Romanov, 1910-1912;* Volume IV., *The beginning of the War of 1914. Diary of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs* (From July 3-16 to July 20, 1914); Volume VIII., *Diplomatic preparation of the Balkan War, 1912.*

[3]*Collection of secret documents from the archives of the former ministry of Foreign Affairs,* Petrograd, 1917; *European powers and Greece during the World War according to secret material* etc., E. A. Adamov, Ed. Moscow, 1922; *The European powers and Turkey during the World War according to secret documents of the former Ministry of Foreign Affairs,* E. A. Adamov, Ed.Moscow,1924; *Constantinople and the Straits according to secret documents of the former Ministry of Foreign Affairs,* E. A. Adamov, Ed. 2 vols. Moscow, 1925-26.

[4]The *Krasny Archiv* (*Red Archives*). Moscow, 1923—1 More than twenty volumes have appeared to date, They are edited by the Tsentralnii Archiv (Central Archives) of U. S. S. R.

This is being supplemented by a second volume now in preparation on the same subject, and by Volume XV, on *The First Balkan War*, which contains the diplomatic correspondence covering the period from May 14 to October 5, 1912, including telegrams of Russian Ministers in the Balkan States, of the Russian ambassadors to Paris, as well as instructions sent out to them by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Petersburg. Of especial interest is the volume published in 1926 on *Tsarist Russia in the World War*. It is ably edited by Petrovsky and arranged in four divisions dealing respectively with Turkey, Bulgaria, Rumania and Italy.

Part of the official correspondence between the Russian Foreign Ministry and Isvolsky, the Tsar's ambassador in Paris, was obtained from the archives and published by René Marchand, a member of the French socialist group, in two volumes soon after the war.[5] More recently a German scholar, F. Stieve, brought together a great many others, and adding to them those of Marchand, brought out a new collection of Isvolsky's correspondence in four volumes, with a searching biographical study of Isvolsky himself.[6] To these should be added the minutes of the military conference of the French and Russian Chiefs of Staff, Baron Schilling's Diary and Dobrorolski's *Die Russische Mobilmachung*.

The secret archives of the Foreign Office of Imperial Germany have fared very much like those of Russia. Following the defeat of the German armies, the government of the Empire broke down, and the Republic was proclaimed. The new government, eager to discredit the Kaiser and the old régime, appointed a commission headed by Karl Kautsky, the socialist historian, to examine the records of the Foreign Office. The commission did not find exactly the incriminating evidence it confidently expected but it discovered enough, and published the so called "Kautsky documents".[7]

---

[5]*Un Livre Noir. Diplomatie d'avant guerre d'apres les documents Russes.* Ed. by René Marchand, 2 vols., Paris, 1922-23.

[6]*Der Diplomatische Schriftwechsel Iswolskis, 1911-14.* Ed. by F. Stieve, 4 vols. Berlin 1925.

[7]*Die deutschen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch,* edited by Karl Kautsky, Walter Shucking, Max Monteglas, A. Mendelhson-Bartholdy, 4 vols., Berlin, 1919; translated under the title, Outbreak of the World War, 2 vols. N. Y. 1924.

Dissatisfied with the inadequate character of the story of pre-war diplomacy revealed by the documents relating to the years immediately preceding 1914, the government of the republic decided to lay bare the whole story of imperial diplomacy from the date of the founding of the empire to the outbreak of the World War. The events and developments of 1912-1914 were after all either directly or indirectly the results of the policies of earlier years, and only by going back to the origins of the alliances and *ententes*, and by tracing their evolution in the light of plans and motives revealed in the documents year by year, could a scientific view of the history of pre-war diplomacy be obtained. In 1914, the series now known to every student of modern history as *Die Grosse Politik*[8] was started. The editors were given a free hand to publish any and every document that seemed to them of importance in the history of Germany's international relations during the forty-four years of the existence of the Empire.

By revealing the truth, said Rathenau before the Reichstag in 1922, the great publication will contribute greatly to the moral peace of the world. The work is still in progress, over forty volumes having appeared. Because of the momentous importance of the events with which it deals and more especially through the fact that they relate to so recent a period, the work not only gives us the most important series of diplomatic documents published up to the present, but it breaks the long established precedent of secrecy and silence. For these reasons, too, it has attracted the attention of scholars and statesmen in all parts of the world. Literally scores of historians, students, journalists and others are searching these columns for light on the foreign policies, not only of Germany, but of the other powers.

A French translation is being made under the auspices of La Sociète de l'Histoire de la Guerre, with the well known historian A. Aulard, as general editor.[9] This translation departs considerably from the German original in the matter of arrangement. In the

[8] *Die grosse Politik der europaischen Kabinette*, 1871-1914, edited by J. Lepsius, A. Mendelsohn-Bartholdy and F. Thimme, Berlin, 1922.

[9] *La politique extérieure de l'Allemagne*, 1870-1914, Paris, 1927. The first volume, translated by Henri Audoin has just appeared, with the scholarly introduction by Professor Aulard.

latter the editors adopted the topical method with a chronological arrangement of the documents on each large topic or division. As a result large documents are often divided, one part being found under one topic, another under another. The French adopted the simple chronological arrangement following in that, the practice of their Yellow Books. To facilitate the use of the materials, however, a topical table of contents is added. This is not the place to discuss the relative merits of the two plans. Each has its merits; together, they supplement each other admirably, one serves as a check upon the other. The French translation, for example, through its chronological arrangement, will not only show where the selection of documents has been liberal, and where meagre, but it will prove very helpful in suggestions as to other important documents for publication.[10]

Austria opened her archives soon after the war, and R. Gooss published three important volumes on Austro-Hungarian pre-war diplomacy,[11] followed later by A. E. Pribram's *Secret treaties of Austro-Hungary*.[12] To these should be added the four large volumes of Conrad von Hötzendorf *Aus Meiner Dienstzeit*. Several years ago the British foreign office decided to publish extensive selections of the more important documents relating to its foreign policy, entrusting the editorship to the able scholarship of Professor G. P. Gooch and Colonel Harold Temperley.[13]

France, as we have already said, adheres to the old policy of secrecy, declining to follow the example of the other powers, save for the relatively meagre revelations in three Yellow Books, L'Al-

[10] In addition to the publication of the documents of the Foreign Office the Germans have been very active in gathering up, translating and publishing stray material as it appears in different countries. In 1921, they organized *The Central* Bureau for *research into the causes of the War* with Alfred Von Wagner in charge. Under his editorship the monthly periodical *Die Kriegsschuld Frage* has been published since 1923. Along with *Europäische Gespräche* founded by Professor Mendelssohn-Bartholdy it is, as Dr. Gooch points out, indispensable to the student of this subject.

[11] *The Austrian red book*, edited by R. Gooss, 3 vols., London, 1922.

[12] *The secret treaties of Austro-Hungary, 1879-1914*, by A. F. Pribram, edited by A. C. Coolidge, Cambridge, Mass., 1922-23.

[13] *British official documents on the origins of the war, 1898-1914*, selected and edited by G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, XI vols., London, 1926—. Only the last and the first two volumes have appeared thus far.

liance *Franco-Russe, Les Accords Franco-Italiens,* 1900-1902, and *Les Affaires Balkaniques.* True, these are of the highest importance but they are after all very limited in scope and far from satisfying to scholars. This is the more regrettable because the important rôle of France in the Triple Entente makes the archives, of the French foreign office of unusual significance in the study of the international policies of the pre-war years. As Dr. Gooch has correctly said "It is the wish not of her ancient foes alone, but also of well-tried friends, that France may fall into line with the other Great Powers, and reveal more of the jealously guarded treasures of the Quai d'Orsay. No civilized State is likely to suffer as much in the good opinion of a democratic world from disclosures of its diplomacy as it does by permitting the suspicion that it has guilty secrets to conceal."[14] In the meantime several other countries, notably, Italy and Serbia, have announced their intention to publish their diplomatic documents of the period.

Numerous illustrations of the arbitrary conduct of foreign affairs are found in the history of all the great powers in the decade before the War. Disraeli's action in the Russo-Turkish war is well known. Salisbury was a trifle more disposed to take his colleagues into his confidence and to respect the claims of parliament, though one cannot help having the suspicion that his action was, at times at least, dictated by a desire to protect himself. On the occasion of Bismarck's proposal for an Anglo-German alliance, in 1889, Salisbury replied that while he personally thought an alliance would be a blessing for both countries and for the peace of Europe, he and his colleagues found that it would break up the parliamentary majority and overthrow the ministry. "Unfortunately," he said, "we are no longer living in the time when the aristocracy ruled and we could pursue an active policy. Democracy is now the ruler and with it party government, which has made every ministry depend absolutely on the *aura popularis.*"

In some respects this was true. But in general even Salisbury was in the habit of keeping parliament in the dark when foreign affairs were concerned, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be said, that parliament either directed or controlled English diplomacy during his administrations.

[14]Gooch, G. P., *Recent Revelations* of European Diplomacy, N. Y., 1927, p. 133.

His successors, Lansdowne and Grey, adhered strictly to the old system. Indeed, the conspiracy of silence if anything, became stronger. Attached to the Convention of 1904 between England and France in regard to Egypt and Morocco were five secret articles. When the main body of the treaty was made public, a private member, Mr. Weir, asked the under-secretary for foreign affairs if there were any secret clauses attached to the Anglo-French agreement. The facetious reply made for the government by Lord Percy is typical: "Speculation and conjecture as to the existence or non-existence of secret clauses in international treaties," he said, "is a public privilege, maintenance of which depends upon official reticence."

The secret articles were not made public till 1911, when they were published by the *Temps*.

The same official reticence was maintained in regard to the important conversations and arrangements between the military and naval authorities of the two countries. These, Grey inherited from Lansdowne but they were greatly extended during his direction of the Foreign Office. The nature and the extent of the conversations were kept strictly secret. Nor was Parliament or the Cabinet informed when, after the second Morocco crisis, the verbal understanding was finally put into writing in the now famous Grey-Cambon letters. Someone in the inner group urged it for the sake of definiteness. Even then the secrets were carefully guarded by the select few against repeated efforts on the part of members of Parliament to get at the facts.

Lord Hugh Cecil addressing the Prime Minister, on March 10, 1913, said:

> There is a very general belief that this country is under an obligation, not a treaty obligation, but an obligation arising out of an assurance given by the Ministry, in the course of diplomatic negotiations, to send a very large armed force out of this country to operate in Europe. This is the general belief.

Asquith's reply left plenty of room for suspicion. "I ought," he said, "to say that that is not true."

Several days later, on March 24, he was more emphatic, saying:

> As has been repeatedly stated, this country is not under any obligation, not public and known to Parliament, which compels it to take part in a war. In other words, if a war arises between European Powers, there are no unpublished agreements which will restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war.[15]

Finally, however, when Grey under pressure of the events in August, 1914, read the letters to the Commons, the situation appeared in a somewhat different light. Referring to the question of British commitments, he said that he and the Prime Minister had assured the House more than once that in the case of a crisis, "We should come before the House of Commons and be able to say to the House that it was free to decide what the British attitude would be, that we would have no secret engagements which we should spring upon the House and tell the House that because we entered into that engagement, there was an obligation of honor upon the country ..."[16] After reviewing the development of the Entente he came in conclusion to the Grey-Cambon Letters, but in reading he omitted the last and vital sentence which reads:

> If those measures involve action, the plans of the General Staffs would at once be taken into consideration, and the government would then decide what effect should be given them.[17]

The significance of this either by itself or when taken in connection with the rest of Grey's policy does not concern us here any more than does the question of the justice or the expediency of his policy as a whole. The question at issue from the point of view of this investigation is that at no time, not even at the last moment, was Parliament or the nation permitted to learn precisely what the relations of England to the continental alliances were.

In his *Memoirs*, Grey says the omission was unintentional, that it doubtless occurred because of an interruption at that particular point in the reading. It did not occur to him, he says, that any importance attached to the sentence. Be that as it may parliament

[15] "Parliamentary Debates," Series IV., Vol. 183, C. 994-1000.
[16] "Parliamentary Debates," Series V., Vol. 65, C. 1812.
[17] "British White Paper," Enclosure No. 1, in 105.

was kept in ignorance to the very last, just as it was on the question of the Anglo-Russian negotiations for a naval accord in 1914.

Following the visit of the King and Queen, accompanied by Grey in April to Paris, negotiations for a naval convention with Russia along the lines of the Anglo-French agreements were begun. Through a leakage at the Russian embassy, however, the facts got to Berlin and were published in the *Berliner Tageblatt.* Suspicions were aroused and Grey felt obliged to deny the rumors. Referring to the prime minister's statement quoted above he said: "No negotiations with any power had been or were being or were likely to be undertaken which would make this less true. If any such convention were contemplated which would modify the prime minister's declaration it would have to be laid before Parliament." "This ambiguous phraseology," says Dr. Gooch,"[18] was interpreted in different ways; but the inability to meet a plain question with a direct negative confirmed the suspicious ones in their fears." Reporting to Sasnov, who had expressed his annoyance at the slowness of the negotiations, Benckendorff said, on July 2, "I see no reason to believe that the government has the least objection to carry out the Paris project. If it is not yet finished, it is because Prince Louis is to complete the negotiations in Petrograd. Another cause of the delay is the indiscretions. Perhaps Sir Edward wishes that the disquietude in Berlin should diminish before he goes further. As a matter of fact, he would find it difficult at the same moment to issue a *dimentis* and to negotiate."

This relationship between parliament and the Foreign Office during the decade before the World War in the control of foreign affairs is admirably summed up by Lord Curzon in 1908:

> "We concede, and I think rightly concede here in this country a wide and almost unlimited discretion in treaty-making to our governments. They conduct their negotiations in absolute secrecy. Parliament knows little of what is going on, and the public knows less. From time to time a minister with artless candour may lift a corner of the veil and disclose the ravishing beauty of the object behind. In the present case we were denied even that privilege. The government has, it is true, power to consult, or not to consult, experts as they please, and I have

[18] Gooch, G. P., *"Modern European History,"* 1878-1919, p. 529-31.

> noticed as a rather remarkable coincidence that treaties have a habit of being signed a few days after the rising of the House of Commons. In that way immunity from parliamentary criticism for at least six months is secured."[19]

Frequent efforts to reform conditions have occurred, from the long debate in 1886 to the defeat of Mr. Trevelyan's motion on the subject in 1925. The principal arguments can be readily found in the parliamentary debates on the different occasions.

In November, 1911, the House of Commons, after an earnest debate on the subject, passed a resolution directing its ambassadors abroad to report on the conduct and control of foreign affairs in the country to which they were accredited. The reports were published in a Blue Book entitled "*An Investigation into the Control of Foreign Affairs.*" Some are excellent, and the series as a whole constitutes a very valuable review of the then current theory and practice.[20]

After the war the demands became more frequent, reaching a climax in the opposition measure introduced by Mr. Trevelyan in 1925, just referred to. The motion read:

> "That no treaty shall be ratified and no diplomatic arrangement or understanding with a foreign state involving, directly or indirectly, national obligations, shall be concluded without the consent of Parliament, and no preparation for co-operation in war between the naval, military or air staffs, and the naval, military or air staffs of a foreign state shall be lawful unless consequent upon such arrangement or understanding; and this Resolution shall be communicated to all states with which this country is in diplomatic relations and to the League of Nations."[21]

Of course the motion was lost; no one expected it to pass. If the Labor government while in power did not inaugurate reform, it could hardly be expected from the Conservatives.

The organic laws of France provide several checks which in theory reserve considerable control to the Legislature.[22] In prac-

[19]"Parliamentary Debates," Series IV-V., 183, C. 994-1000.

[20]"Parliamentary Papers," 1912-13, "Accounts and Papers." Misc. LXVIII Cd. 6102.

[21]Cp. "Parliamentary Debates," Series V. Vol. 181, C. 1430.

[22]Cp. Article 3 of the Law on the Organization of the Public Powers adopted on February 25, and Articles 8 and 9 of the Law upon the Relations of the Public Powers of July 16, 1875; Duvergier, Lois, LXXV., 42-53 and 250-255.

tice, however, it has proven very slight. This is true also of the rôle of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies, for only in very rare instance does it appear to have had any determining influence upon the policies and actions of the *Quai d'Orsay*. The circumstances under which the constitutional laws were adopted in 1875 were favorable to the creation of a strong executive department.[23]

By Article VIII. of the Organic Law "The President of the Republic negotiates and ratifies treaties. He communicates them to the Chambers as soon as the interests and safety of the state permit." This manifestly places in his hands the right to determine when the "interests of the state" make it wise for him to inform the Legislature of conventions and treaties he may have negotiated. This at least was the thought of the commission as revealed by the following remark of the member who submitted the plan: "We leave it to him (the president) to judge the cases which demand secrecy."[24] True, treaties of peace and commerce do not become definitive until they have been voted by the two chambers. These are not, however, the treaties that really matter.

Treaties of alliance and military conventions which are from their very nature likely to be more momentous in their consequences are not subject to legislative veto. Of the two conventions with Germany in regard to Morocco, for example, only the agreement for the cession of Congo territory was submitted and not the Morocco Convention proper. The latter, to which it was only an annex, as it were, was kept secret. Treaties of alliance, says Esmein, are not included in the class that have to be submitted under Article 8. This statement cannot be accepted in its entirety, however, because there is the exception that "treaties involving the finances of the state" call for legislative action. Obviously, however, there is room for wide difference of opinion. Does it refer only to financial aid given to the other contracting party or also to

---

[23]The determination of the two Royalist groups to reëstablish the monarchy had been frustrated by the White Flag letter, but they did not for that reason accept the idea of a permanent republic. Even in the drafting of the constitution the idea of its availability in case of a monarchial restoration were kept in mind. Laboulaye in reporting the law on the powers of the Executive for the Commission on July 16, 1875, made a special plea for a strong executive.

[24]"Annales de l'Assemblée Nationale," 38, 223.

liabilities of an implied character? Further the chambers cannot modify or amend treaties submitted to them; they can only approve or reject.

In the matter of declaring war and making peace the law is explicit. "The president of the Republic," says Article 9, "shall not declare war without the previous consent of the two Houses." This would seem ample guarantee against Executive action on this score. Yet in 1914 the question of war was not submitted to the Chambers. That Poincaré was anxious to avoid the necessity is well known. Germany's declaration saved him from doing so. France did not declare war "without the consent of the two chambers"; she did not declare war at all on either Germany or Austria. On the other hand she was bound by her engagements with Russia to do so, and it is an interesting matter for speculation whether France could have assumed the offensive if Germany had held off. At any rate the chambers would have been confronted with commitments made during a period of more than twenty years, and a *fait accompli* over which they had had no control.

There is a Commission on foreign affairs of which the British minister in Paris, in response to the request of his government, referred to above, reported as follows: "The Chamber of Deputies appoints sixteen grand committees at the beginning of each fresh legislature to examine and report on questions concerning the various departments of state with which the House is called upon to deal. One of these committees is the commission on foreign and colonial affairs. It is elected for the whole legislative period (four years) and composed of forty-four members, designated by the various political groups in proportion to their numerical strength. The choice has to be confirmed by the chamber at a public sitting. The committee does not examine the Budget for foreign affairs, as the yearly credits for that department are discussed by the general Budget Committee (Commission du Budget). The foreign affairs committee reports to the chamber on all questions relating to foreign policies which are submitted to it. It may summon before it any persons whose evidence may be of a nature to guide it in its deliberations. When these persons hold an official post the minister concerned must first give his consent, with or without the condition that professional secrecy is to be observed. A minister himself

may be requested to appear and give explanations to the committee on points of policy. Although, in theory a minister is not obliged to appear before the committee, his refusal to do so would not be in harmony with French parliamentary traditions. All papers which the committee desires to consult are communicated to it through its chairman by the competent minister. Should the latter consider that reasons of state forbid him to communicate any document thus asked for, the minister informs the chairman of the committee, who usually acquiesces in the minister's view. If the committee persists in its demand, the matter is brought before the chamber. Should the latter support the committee such action is likely to bring about a ministerial crisis."[25]

But even the Commission is rarely told of the more important commitments at the time they are made. The debates contain many complaints of the unwillingness of ministers to supply the desired facts. Speaking of the Franco-German treaty on December 14, 1911, Count de Mun said: "Doubts on our commitments to Spain would still exist, if, in the commission on foreign affairs... we had not undertaken to tear away, bit by bit, the veil of diplomacy and to cause to appear at last all these secret treaties of which we were ignorant when we came together."[26] While the Commission may under certain circumstances examine witnesses under oath and pursue investigations even abroad, its competency to command the documents of the Foreign Office or compel attendance of witnesses is not generally accepted. Even under the law of 1914, witnesses can only be obliged to do so in inquiries specifically ordered by the Chamber.[27]

The reports of the Commission to the Chamber are far from being as complete as they might be. Very often they omit a good deal of material that came before it. Thus the project for the bill on the Congo agreement of 1911, for example, has no mention of the negotiations with Germany which led up to the treaty, though it does give the secret articles of the Anglo-French and Franco-Spanish

---

[25] "British Parliamentary Papers," 1912-13, "Account and Papers," Misc. LXVIII., Cd. 6102.

[26] Cp. *Journal Officiel*, Chambre Debats, 1911, p. 39172.

[27] *Ibid.*, 1914, p. 2650. Cp. also on this general question Esmein and Barthélmy.

treaties of 1904.[28] The fact that it was not until 1911 that these treaties were finally made known to the Deputies, and, not even to the Commission until six years had elapsed, as we learn from Count de Mun's statement, is another illustration of the lack of control by the Deputies over the Policies of the Foreign Office.

The Deputies like the members of other Lower Houses have, of course, the right to ask questions. Indeed, there is a special provision for this in the rules of both Houses, a clear distinction being made between oral questions and interpellation. The former cannot be asked without the consent of the minister concerned having been first obtained, and then only at the beginning or the end of a session. They cannot lead to a general debate. The answers for the most part are unsatisfactory and beyond the control of the Chambers because the article specifically protects the minister if he declines to answer. It reads:

> Les ministres ont la faculté de declarer, par ècrit que l' interêt public leur interdit de repondre ou, à titre exceptionel, qu'il reclamant un délai pour rassembler les élèments de leur réponse.

Interpellations on the other hand can be made at any time, but have to be introduced by a "demand" in writing and signed by one or more members. It is read by the president of the chamber and a date for the discussion is fixed, usually within a month, save in the case of interpellation on foreign affairs which may be deferred for a longer period. Once up for debate, however, an interpellation may result in what is tantamount to a vote of lack of confidence and the overthrow of the ministry.

Plainly the rules give little encouragement to members to occupy themselves with foreign affairs. From a careful count made recently in connection with this study it was found that 5424 questions *écrites* were asked from April, 1910, to April, 1914. In June and July, 1914, during the brief session following the general election and just before the war, 338 more came in.

Strange as it may seem, however, only a small number were addressed to the Foreign Minister, and of these, all but a few had to do with minor questions. That is to say, during the years when

---

[28]Documents Parlementaires, Chambres, 1911, Sess. Extr. No. 1413, pp. 304-337.

the Republic was conducting the most important foreign negotiations of its existence, and making commitments of vital and far-reaching importance, the Deputies were not only not aware of what was going on, but, being ignorant, were not even curious.

On November 26, 1912, M. Brisson asked the Foreign Minister to tell the Chambers "to what France is engaged by the terms of the secret treaty of alliance between France and Russia, and by those of the Franco-English Entente." The minister's reply was, that the "government cannot reply to this question."[29] A week later Camille Reboul asked the Foreign Minister "whether he could make known the claims and the consequences of the treaty of alliance with Russia." He received the same reply.[30] In connection with the interpellations in March, 1911, Deputy Jaurés declared:

> It is a scandalous and monstrous thing that today in the European and world wide civilization, there are secret treaties between two great peoples which may be in contradiction to the will of the people themselves and to the stipulation of public law.[31]

In view of the inability of the Deputies and the Senate to obtain satisfactory information through questions and interpellations, it need hardly be pointed out that the Yellow Books (*Livres Jaunes*), which, like the English Blue Books, and the German White Books, are supposed to furnish important information on diplomatic matters to parliament, are rarely published until long after the events. Even then they are surprisingly incomplete, containing only such information as the government considers it expedient at the time to publish. The Yellow Book on the Franco-Russian alliance, for example, was not published till 1918, twenty-seven years after the alliance was made. Even then none of the documents on the important military conventions after 1899 are included, despite the fact that these were specifically incorporated into the political agreement. The papers on the Franco-Italian accord of 1902 on the Morocco question were not given to the chambers until 1920. In connection with the debates on the Franco-German convention, signed on November 4, 1911, the

---

[29] *Journal Officiel*, Dec. 2, Chambre Débats, p. 2915.
[30] *Ibid.*, Dec. 12, Chambre Débats, p. 10402.
[31] *Ibid*, Chambre Debats, March 24, 1911, p. 1436.

promised Yellow Book was delayed despite a resolution in the chamber calling for its distribution. The foreign minister, supported by the prime minister, objected because "the consent of foreign governments concerned must first be secured." These illustrations show clearly that the Yellow Books are apt to be of greater use to the historian than to the legislators in their consideration of current problems.

The constitution of imperial Germany provided, among other insignificant checks, a consultative committee on foreign affairs of the Federal Council presided over by Bavaria. Its control over the foreign policy, however, was quite unimportant. The Emperor exercised autocratic power in the conduct of foreign affairs, although in practice a great deal of latitude seems to have been left for considerable periods of time at least, to the Chancellor and influential persons like "His gray Eminence," Holstein of the Foreign Office.[32] Every now and then the erratic eruption of the Kaiser asserting his imperial prerogative makes its appearance. The outstanding examples are, of course, the *Daily Telegraph* interview, and the Kruger Telegram. Another of a more intimate nature appears in the extraordinary marginal comments on certain documents relating to the Serbian crisis during the fateful days of July, 1914. Against the statement that his Ambassador at Vienna had urged moderation on Austria, he wrote "Who authorized him to do this?" On Lichnowsky's dispatch from London the Kaiser's irritation finds expression in such drastic phrases as "The Serbs must be finished as soon as possible." "Serbia's national dignity does not exist...the question has nothing to do with Grey; it is his Majesty Francis Joseph's affair. What colossal British impudence."[33]

Equally instructive in this connection is the "Willy-Nicky Correspondence" and the Björkoe agreement in 1909. By the latter

---

[32]Von Eckhardstein in his "Ten Years at the Court of St. James" draws attention to the important rôle played by Holstein during these years. With Bülow he sought the rapprochment with England while the Kaiser favored an understanding with Russia till the rejection of the Björkoe accord showed the futility of efforts in that direction.

[33]Karl Kautsky, *Comment c'est delanchée la guerre mondiale.* Scores of similar examples are found in the volumes of "Die Grosse Politik der Europaischen Kabinette," 1871-1914.

the two Emperors bound themselves and their respective governments to such an extent that when the Russian cabinet was informed the ministers refused to give their consent. Count Witte bluntly asked the Tsar if he had forgotten that he had an alliance with France. After much hesitation Lamsdorff was authorized to telegraph Berlin that the Björkoe agreement could not stand. To the German reply that it had the signature of the Tsar, the only answer was a repetition of the telegram that the agreement could not stand.

Here we have an interesting example of the strength of the Foreign Office against the autocratic power of the Tsar. Nominally Nicholas II directed Russia's Foreign policy. In reality, however, the ministers were stronger. Yet it was only the chance of the ministers standing firm that kept a personal exchange of courtesies between the two autocrats of Germany and Russia from changing entirely the direction of the foreign policies of the two empires. For once the will of the Tsar was unequal to the task of compelling the Cabinet. The ministers had their way. The Russian Foreign Office had come into its own.

The despotic, almost capricious management of Austria-Hungary's foreign affairs before the World War is well known. Berchthold's delays in order to prevent Germany's suggestions that Austria moderate her policy at Belgrade from reaching Francis Joseph while there was still time to act, was exposed soon after the War. Neither the Austrian nor the Hungarian parliaments had anything to do with the minister's policy, and the Delegations left matters largely to the ministers and the ruler. Berchthold's action is interesting, however, as an outstanding example of the power possessed by foreign ministers and executives to create a situation which may make war inevitable.[34]

In this country we flatter ourselves that we have a Constitution more or less fool proof on this score. Considering the time and the circumstances of their adoption, the provisions for the control of foreign affairs are remarkable. Even to-day, despite the demands of new conditions and the growing complexity of international problems, the system set up by the Founders seems reasonably adequate. Certainly it continued for a long time the most en-

[34]The story of the Austro-Hungarian policy following the assassination of the Archduke is now told byBerchthold himself in his Memoirs.

lightened and effective effort at democratic control of foreign affairs in existence.

In view, however, of the careful attention given to the subject abroad, and the interesting plans incorporated in most of the new constitutions of Europe, there are those who claim that our own system is in need of radical revision. Certainly we no longer stand out conspicuously in the forefront of the movement for democratic control. We have a Senate committee on foreign affairs, senatorial veto on diplomatic appointments, and ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Congress alone can declare war. It controls the purse and, as a last resort, it may impeach the president if he oversteps the bounds of his constitutional powers. But as every student of American diplomatic history knows, the sphere of Executive action is not only extremely wide, but despite these checks, it often oversteps the prerogatives conferred upon it by the Constitution.[35]

The tendency to place more and more power in the hands of the Executive is growing, and along with it an increasing disposition to hedge in the acts of the State Department with the customary diplomatic secrecy.

Indeed, there are significant cases in our recent history where the Executive, following close upon the European custom of making commitments in secret, has created precedents, which, if persisted in, bid fair not only to brush aside the legislative control established by the Constitution, but to involve us in complications quite foreign to the wishes of the people. Again and again in the history of our international relations dangerous situations have been created by the independent action of the Executive; gentlemen's agreements have been made, conventions or Executive understandings like that of 1905 by President Roosevelt for the administration of the customs of San Domingo, and actual usurpations as in the case of Panama, have been executed without consulting even the Senate committee on foreign relations.

---

[35]For a thorough and scholarly discussion of the control of foreign affairs in the Constitution and practice of the United States see: Quincy Wright; *The Control of American Foreign Relations*, N. Y. 1922; also E. S. Corwin; *The Presidents control of foreign relations*, Princeton, 1917; John Bassett Moore, *Principles of American diplomacy.*

Commenting on the San Domingo affair, Mr. Roosevelt said, "The Constitution did not explicitly give me power to bring about the necessary agreement with Santa Domingo. But the Constitution did not forbid my doing what I did. I put the agreement into effect, and I continued its execution for two years before the Senate acted; and I would have continued it to the end of my term, if necessary, without any action by Congress."[36] "I determined on the move," says Mr. Roosevelt, "without consulting the cabinet, precisely as I took Panama without consulting the cabinet." If there is any doubt as to the seriousness of such action, it will surely be quickly dispelled by a perusal of the terms of the understanding with Japan in 1905 as revealed in the Roosevelt-Lodge papers.

According to these, President Roosevelt in 1905, through his personal representative definitely assured the prime minister of Japan, Count Katsura of our coöperation with Great Britain and Japan in the Far East. An "agreed memorandum" of the understanding was formally endorsed on July 31 by the President as follows: "Your conversation with Count Katsura absolutely correct in every respect. Wish you would state to Katsura that I confirm every word you said."[37] The agreement involved among other things, an assurance by the Japanese of peaceful intentions in regard to the Philippines, we in turn agreeing to acquiesce in the Japanese policy toward Korea. Yet our ambassador to Japan, Mr. Lloyd C. Griscom, was not informed, nor did the Senate committee on foreign relations know anything about it. On the latter the President expressed himself forcibly on May 6: "As to what you say about the alliance, the trouble is, my dear Kennan, that you are speaking academically. Have you followed some of my experience in endeavoring to get treaties through the Senate? I might just as well strive for the moon as for such a policy as you indicate. . . ."

Nevertheless he committed the nation to a definite policy to which he would have been morally bound to adhere as long as he was in office, whether Congress or the nation approved of it or not.

---

[36]Theodore Roosevelt, *An Autobiography*, p. 510.

[37]Cp. Tyler Dennett, "President Roosevelt's Secret Pact with Japan." *Current History Magazine*, October, 1924.

Altogether the memorandum constitutes one of the most remarkable executive agreements in American history.

Equally instructive from the point of view of this discussion is the now famous voyage of the fleet around the world. In a way, it put to the test the indirect control of our foreign affairs assigned to Congress through appropriations. There was, it will be recalled, money to send the fleet to the Pacific, and the president, with a humorous sense of the realities in the situation, significantly said, if Congress didn't appropriate funds to bring it back it would stay there. While this is not exactly controlling our foreign relations, it comes very nearly doing so. Even the Cabinet was not consulted in the matter. Mr. Roosevelt said later: "I determined on the move without consulting the Cabinet, precisely as I took Panama without consulting the Cabinet."[38]

There is, of course, always the power of impeachment in cases where the Executive is too arbitrary in his defiance of Congress. In general, however, the president as the elected Executive may be counted on to reflect fairly closely the wishes of the people. Moreover, he is better able to know the pulse of the nation than is Congress, and if he is judicious in building up public opinion through the press and other powerful agencies at his command in these days, he can nullify most of the constitutional limitations upon his power in the control and direction of our foreign affairs.

Even so careful an Executive as President McKinley in 1900 acted in China without Congressional authority, ordering our troops to co-operate with those of other powers in the storming of Tien Tsin and the march on Peking. Congress and the people had no voice in determining McKinley's policy any more than they had in controlling what really was an exercise of the war powers of the president in time of peace. Further, the treaty subsequently made with China seems never to have been ratified by the Senate.

Addressing a small group of speakers recently, Senator Borah frankly acknowledged that it was quite within the competence of our State Department to create a condition in our international relations that would make war inevitable.

Why usurpations of this kind by the Executive are not more often repudiated is a matter of considerable interest. The answer,

[38] *Opus cit.*, p. 547.

obviously, is that Congress and people are usually in accord or that they are not informed in time. When they do learn of the commitments it is too late to effect a change of policy and it becomes a matter of patriotism to fall in line. The consequences of reversing or repudiating the action of the Executive would be too serious.

Occasionally, however, when Executive acts go too far in committing the country, or are too violently out of accord with the traditions of our foreign policy, public opinion may force their revision or even their complete renunciation. The most outstanding example of this occurred in connection with President Wilson's policies at Paris during and immediately after his first visit in 1918. For reasons now well known, strong opposition to his plans, notably on the League of Nations, developed, and a powerful propaganda against the president and his policies was inaugurated. Whether for good or ill, the results were of tremendous significance both at home and abroad. We did not agree to the treaty of Versailles, the Senate did not ratify the security pact with France, and we did not join the League of Nations, despite the fact that our war president had openly and in person committed the nation to all three. Here at least is an instance where the constitutional inhibitions upon Executive power were brought into play. What the state of our foreign relations and those of Europe and the world would be today had the usual indifference to our foreign relations prevailed in 1918, makes interesting food for speculation.

The new constitutions of Europe all make provisions for a measure of parliamentary control and supervision.[39] In the main they provide that treaties in order to be binding be ratified either by the legislature itself or be passed upon by a standing committee on foreign affairs. Norway has provided for a special parliamentary committee to examine the secret protocols of the government. These protocols disclose the decisions made by the cabinet concerning military matters and secret diplomatic affairs. The committee reports the arrangements to Parliament adding its approval or disapproval. As a result, according to Oscar Pedersen, Parliament is not only promptly informed as to developments in the conduct of foreign affairs, but it exercises an effective check on the government

[39]For a brief discussion of this subject see H. L. McBain, and L. Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe*, N. Y. 1922.

through the fact that it subjects its policies and acts to examination and revision immediately. Sweden has a similar commission, but since it reports to the King rather than to the parliament, it does not secure adequate control.

In most of the new constitutions it is provided that war and peace can be decided only by the legislature. They all have provisions for a legislative commission on foreign affairs similar to the French, but with more powers. The German commission, for example, may sit even when the Diet is not in session. In this manner the executive is subject to supervision, both by the commission and the legislature. The Swiss go a step further by extending the initiative and referendum to treaties. For some reason, however, this practice does not seem to commed itself and it is not found in the constitutions of the new states. Indeed the Esthonians specifically forbid it.

Into the merits or demerits of the different means of securing more popular control of foreign affairs I cannot enter. In general they are aimed at the time-honored claims of the old school of diplomacy, which holds that questions of a diplomatic nature are too difficult and delicate for legislative supervision or control; that they require speedy action, and that because of their bilateral character popular discussion and vote would cause difficulties with other states. Against this point of view both theory and practice of recent years has gone a long way.

The principle of democratic control over foreign relations is being more and more recognized. The monarchical control which existed up to 1914 with the more despotic governments is gone entirely. Likewise the extraordinary powers exercised by the executive is being steadily limited by the legislature. Nor should the fact be overlooked that in many democracies of to-day, the chief of the executive power is himself the direct representative of the people.

Finally there is the League of Nations, whose influence and importance in the matter of foreign affairs is continually underestimated in many quarters. The League got off to a bad start by being too seriously tied up with the post-war treaties, and the cause of international co-operation has suffered as a consequence. But in spite of this difficulty, which is being gradually corrected, the League represents a great step forward. Here at last the nations

of the world have the machinery ready at hand for a reasonable and business-like discussion of their difficulties. The world can no longer be stampeded into a war as in 1914 because of fears and alarms growing out of ignorance, or because, from a lack of adequate means for timely discussion, the situation is left entirely to secret diplomacy. At present there are no international problems on which the Secretariat of the League does not already have much data and information. If any acute issue arises like the Greek-Bulgar dispute in 1925-26, the Council of the League commands not only the machinery for handling questions and the means to set it in motion promptly, but it has ready at hand the needed material on which the powers can base a fair arrangement.

Further, by the provisions of the Covenant, all treaties between the members of the League to be valid must be registered with the Secretariat. In this way the policies of different nations become fairly well known. Secret commitments unfortunately still exist. Even the terms of important treaties like the French-Belgian accord are not published, the signatories claiming that publicity would destroy the value of the treaty. But the influences against the practice are growing stronger each year. Certainly there is being built up at Geneva a world wide international organization and through it an international attitude of mind, that is exercising a powerful influence on the direction and control of the foreign affairs of every nation, whether members of the League or not.

For the present, however, even after we accept the most optimistic claims for progress both through the provisions in the new constitutions, and through the activities of the League of Nations, the fact remains that popular control of foreign affairs still lags far behind the democratization that has taken places in other departments of the governments of our time; "with all the boasted advance of democracy in other fields," says a well known authority, "a heavy veil is still allowed by mutual consent to fall between the people and the statesmen to whom it is given to open and shut the gates of the temple of Janus."[40] Because of the extreme gravity of the issues involved, however, issues charged with potential tragedy in the life of every nation, this situation is receiving more and more attention, and improvements are being made continually.

[40]"Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy," Vol. III., p. 538.

Economic pressure, the need of security against the terrible dangers of scientific warfare of the future and the enlightened opinion of all nations are working for the publicity of international agreements. Diplomacy may have to carry on negotiations in secret, but agreements once reached and signed should be made known not only to the peoples particularly concerned, but to other nations as well. Only in this way can the "Achilles heel of democracy" be made as invulnerable as the rest of the body politic of modern nations.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH

Recently, the attention of the Powers has been diverted from China to the little, independent Kingdom of Albania. Italy has manifested a desire to maintain the *status quo* there, presumably against Jugoslav aggression. She seems determined to control the Strait of Otranto, which combines the Adriatic with the Mediterranean. Again the Balkans and the Near East figure prominently in the discussions of foreign ministers. We are, thus, brought face to face with the conflicting interests of European Powers in the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean Sea is a great international water-way. It affords access to Africa and Asia. Its connection with the Red Sea by means of the Suez Canal establishes a short, all-water route to the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean. From the point of view of international shipping-lanes, the two seas are really one. The freedom of navigation is a necessity for all countries having colonial interests in the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East. Furthermore, the Powers, which have colonies on the coast of North Africa, are interested in keeping the lines of communication between them and the mother-country open. Russia, when she turns her attention to Constantinople, will take an active interest in the Bosphorus and the Dardenelles. Obviously there are two kinds of interests. For lack of a better term, they may be designated as "perpendicular interests" and "horizonal interests."

Because of these interests, several European Powers have made an effort to control the narrow inlets and outlets of the two seas. The straits in question are: the Strait of Gibraltar, the narrow strip of water between Sicily and Tunisia (which we may call the Strait of Tunisia), the Strait of Otranto, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and the Bab-el-Mandeb. It is significant that Great Britain, France, and Italy are equally interested in maneuvering for position at Gibraltar, the Strait of Tunisia, and the Bab-el-Mandeb; that Italy does not stand alone in her concern over the Strait of Otranto; and that primarily Great Britain, Turkey, and Russia are involved in the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles.

For the sake of convenience, the Mediterranean can be divided into a western and an eastern part. In the western Mediterranean, we are confronted with the rivalry between Great Britain, France,

Spain, and Italy. The center of this rivalry is the neutral City and Zone of Tangier. By the public and secret agreements of 1904 between Great Britain and France, France got a free hand in Morocco. But in the fall of that year she transferred the northern shore to Spain, ostensibly because of the Spanish interests in the *praesidios*. Thus, the shore opposite Gibraltar was placed in the hands of a minor Power. Tangier, which had been the seat of the diplomatic corps for about a century, was to retain its special character. By the Statute of 1923, it was placed under the sovereignty of the Sultan of Morocco. He is now represented there by a *Mendoub*, who has jurisdiction over the Mussulman and Jewish population. The Sultan, however, has relinquished some of his sovereign powers. He recognizes the neutrality of the Zone and delegates legislative powers to an assembly composed of foreigners and natives, and judicial powers to a mixed tribunal. Spain, France, and Great Britain accepting the Statute, have substituted consuls for their diplomatic agents. Italy and the United States have refused to be bound by the Statute. They were not consulted in its drafting.

At the present time, Spain is negotiating with France in Paris over the status of the Neutral Zone. She is demanding the right to incorporate it in her zone in northern Morocco. In this she is opposed by France, which has nominal jurisdiction over the Zone, and by Great Britain, which favors internationalisation. Whether the peculiar character of Tangier will last for twelve years, as specified in the Statute, remains to be seen. Mussolini is not satisfied with the present status. He has recently asked for some degree of representation and control. Will he be satisfied merely with participation in the formation of the constabulary?

The Island of Peregil, just west of Ceuta, has been the object of British ambition. She seized it in 1808 by sending a detachment of infantry and artillery from Gibraltar. Obliged to evacuate it by the protests of the Sultan of Morocco shortly thereafter, she attempted to take it in 1848. The opposition of Spain prevented her. In 1902 there was a rumor that she was negotiating with the *Makhzen* for its cession. Again Madrid objected. It still belongs to Morocco. From time to time, it is reported that officers and engineers go to Peregil for the purpose of hunting. The island,

devoid of population and of no economic value, commands an excellent view of the entire Strait.

In view of the fact that the major portion of France's colonies are situated in North Africa, she is vitally concerned in keeping open the lines of communication between Marseilles and her North African ports. Her necessity to do so is both economic and military. As she becomes more and more industrialized, she will be obliged to depend increasingly upon wheat and fruit from the trans-Mediterranean colonies. Her agriculture will need, in increasing quantities, the phosphates of Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. Moreover, she will desire to develop markets for her growing industry. The natives can be taught to use French cloth, to burn French candles, and to adopt Parisian styles.

From the military viewpoint, France is dependent upon her African colonies for man-power. With a population practically stationary, her position as a Great Power demands ready access to a large armed force in time of stress. Her Algerian *tirailleurs* and *spahis* and her Senegalese troops constitute an efficient body of soldiers. Furthermore, she must maintain secure means of communication between Africa and her Mediterranean ports. In case of necessity, she must be able to send metropolitan troops to Africa for the purpose of maintaining her prestige and making good her claims. A serious blow to her prestige in Africa would, undoubtedly, affect her standing as a Great Power. That, in turn, would bear upon the *status quo* in Europe as established by the post-war treaties.

French control of the western Mediterranean is conditioned upon her advantageous naval bases at Toulon, Corsica, and the North African ports. Eventually, she will develop Bizerte into a great naval harbor. That will enable her to watch more carefully the Strait of Tunisia. The convex side of this arc will lie toward Italy. About a year ago, French military circles were set to thinking over the Italian naval maneuvers operating from Sicily as a base and using the little island of Pantelleria as an objective. They saw that the experience gained in these maneuvers could be easily employed in a naval campaign against Tunis. A slight shifting to the west of the diagram of these operations would result in a plan of attack and invasion from Sicily as a base.

Italy's desire to obtain Tunisia is, of course, well known. She was thwarted in her attempt to get it in 1878 by the unofficial conversations of the French, British, and German spokesmen at the Congress of Berlin. Since then, she has encouraged her people to migrate there. They have responded in great numbers, so that more than fifty per cent of all the white inhabitants of Tunisia today are of Italian origin. This French protectorate is admirably fitted for Italian colonization. Its climate is identical with that of Sicily, and it is not far removed from Italy. It would give her Bizerte, remove the possibility of danger from that port, and establish her complete control over the Strait of Tunisia. That, however, would disturb the balance of power in the western Mediterranean, and diminish the effectiveness of Malta as a British naval base.

Italy's Adriatic policy has been expressed by the Treaty of Tirana of November 27, 1926. Thwarted in her attempt to reap the advantages of the Treaty of London of 1915 by the principle of national self-determination adopted by the Congress of Versailles and by the establishment of an independent Albanian Republic, she has adopted the policy of "peaceful penetration" in Albania. Her predominance in Albanian affairs was established by a loan and a commercial treaty in 1924. In the following year, she lent her assistance in the establishment of the Albanian National Bank. Mussolini is, obviously, seeking to penetrate the country economically in the hope that it may lead to the creation of a protectorate. That will increase the opportunity for the investment of Italian capital and the sale of manufactured goods in the Balkans.

The Treaty of Tirana reveals Mussolini's plans in regard to the Strait of Otranto. Apparently, he intends to add to the Island of Sasseno, by which he now controls the harbor of Valona, the Albanian coast. This, in conjunction with the cities of Fiume and Zara and the island of Cherso, will enable him to convert the Adriatic Sea into an Italian lake and to check effectually Jugoslav access to the Mediterranean. It has been intimated, furthermore, that an Albania under Italian protection would reduce the danger, or supposed danger, arising from the Greek control of the Channel of Corfu. This Channel, lying between the Island of Corfu and the coasts of Albania and Greece, might serve as a naval base for a Greek fleet planning to descend upon the Italian coast. In case of pursuit by an Italian squadron, the Greek ships could withdraw

into the Channel and fortify the inlet and the outlet. Italy's control of Albania would give her access to the inlet on the north and enable her to build fortifications along its eastern shore.

In the eastern Mediterranean there is a complication of international interests not unlike that in the western Mediterranean. Since 1911 Italy has been in possession of Libya. Article 13 of the Treaty of London (1915) promised her an extension of her colonies, provided France and Great Britain obtained additional territory in Africa at the expense of the German possessions. In spite of the distribution of the latter's colonies, however, Italy has received only a small rectification in her favor of the western Libyan frontier from Ghadames to Ghat and of the eastern frontier by the inclusion of the oasis of Jaghbub. Italy's disappointment is by no means dissipated. In fact, it is active in Mussolini's speeches on the Fascist colonial aspirations. In the matter of the Dodecanese Islands she fared better. Her full sovereignty over them has been recognized by Turkey in Article 15 of the Second Treaty of Lausanne of 1923. She has established a naval station on the Island of Leros.

The collapse of Russia and the defeat of Turkey provided an opportunity for a readjustment of the question of the Straits. The subsequent successful assertion of Turkish nationalism resulted in the signing of the Second Treaty of Lausanne and the Straits Convention of July 24, 1923. This Convention is based on "the principle of freedom of transit and of navigation by sea and by air in the Strait of the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmora and the Bosphorus." In time of peace, "merchant vessels and non-military aircraft have complete freedom of navigation and passage by day and by night under any flag and with any kind of cargo." The same provision applies in time of war, Turkey being neutral. In time of war, Turkey being a belligerent, the Straits must remain open to neutral merchant vessels and non-military aircraft, provided they do not carry contraband. Turkey has the right to visit and search the carriers in question.

In time of peace, warships enjoy complete freedom of passage. However, the "maximum force which any one Power may send through the Straits into the Black Sea is not to be greater than that of the most powerful fleet of the littoral Powers of the Black Sea existing in that sea at the time of passage." Nevertheless, the

Powers reserve the "right to send into the Black Sea, at all times and under all circumstances, a force of not more than three ships, of which no individual ship shall exceed 10,000 tons." A Straits Commission is provided to inform the Powers from time to time of the strongest littoral Power fleet. In case of war during which Turkey remains neutral, she may not interfere with the free passage of warships and militray aircraft. Enemy aircraft and warships are, however, forbidden to carry out any hostile act in the Straits. If Turkey should be involved in a war, she must not interfere with the passage of neutral warships through the Straits. She may, of course, take measures to prevent enemy warships from using them. Submarines of friendly Powers must sail on the surface.

In addition to these regulations, provision is made for the demilitarising of both shores of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and for the establishment of a Turkish force of 12,000 men at Constantinople. A Straits Commission is provided for. It is to be composed of a representative of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, all of the Balkan States except Albania, and Russia. The United States is entitled to membership, if she ratifies the Convention. The Commission charged with the enforcement of the Convention is obliged to carry out its duties under the auspices of the League of Nations. Should the freedom of the Straits or the demilitarised zones be threatened, the High Contracting Powers, in any case France, Great Britain, Italy, and Japan, will act jointly and "by all the means that the Council of the League may decide for this purpose."

Obviously, the Straits are free. The chief accomplishment seems to be the fact that naval and aerial engines of war have free access, unless Turkey is one of the belligerents. Is it too much to say that, when reduced to lowest terms, the freedom of the Straits means that the nation that rules the waves controls the Straits?

The Red Sea is an essential connecting-link between the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean. The Suez Canal and the Bab-el-Mandeb are strategic elements of it. The lands surrounding the sea are important not only from the point of view of the control of the shores but also from the standpoint of bases for submarine operations in the Indian Ocean. As open seas are essential at all times to Colonial Powers, these Powers are determined to secure positions of vantage in them or along their shores.

The Suez Canal naturally involves Egypt proper and the Sinai Peninsula. By the unilateral declaration of February 28, 1922 Great Britain terminated her protectorate over Egypt and recognized her as an independent sovereign state. Several matters were reserved for furture discussion. They are: the security of communications of the British Empire in Egypt, the defense of Egypt against all foreign aggression or interference direct or indirect, the protection of foreign residents in Egypt, the protection of minorities, and the Sudan. In short, Great Britain is determined to prevent any danger to her means of communication from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean to develop out of the termination of her protectorate. This determination is expressed also in the ultimatum of November 20, 1924, issued by General Allenby after the assassination of Sir Lee Stack. In it Great Britain insists upon the withdrawal of all Egyptian opposition to the wishes of the British Government concerning the protection of foreign interests in Egypt.

The Sinai Peninsula will undoubtedly grow in importance as the date of the termination of the Suez Canal concession approaches. According to this concession, dated November 30, 1854, the Canal rights are granted for ninety-nine years from the date of the opening throughout. Upon its expiration, the Egyptian Government is to succeed to all the rights and to enter into full possession of the Canal. Should the Egyptian Government in 1968 seek to administer the Canal or to dispose of it to anti-British interests, Great Britain could obtain the Sinai Peninsula, either by occupation or by purchase, and build a new canal from the frontier of Palestine to Akaba. Both canals, however, would be at the mercy of the Power controlling the seas.

The shores of the Red Sea are integral factors of the means of communication between the West and the East. Their ports afford access to the interior for commercial and political purposes. By means of proper irrigation, much of the territory can be made to yield a high grade of cotton. The manufactured goods of the European nations can be disposed of to advantage. By a wise distribution of gold and by the support of the proper tribal chieftain, internal politics can be directed in favor of one Foreign Power or another.

The eastern shore of the Red Sea is comprised of several Arabian states, which bear a direct relationship to the hinterland. Owing to tribal jealousy and feuds and the spread of the Wahabite doctrines, Ibn Saoud, the leader of the Nedjd, has succeeded in establishing himself in the Hedjaz and in taking Asir under his protection. In control of about three-fourths of the eastern coast of the Red Sea, he has become a factor in the question of communication. As the strongest Mohammedan leader of the present day, he is in a position to exert pressure upon Powers with large colonies of Mussulmans. The possession of Mecca, the holiest place in the Mohammedan world and the center of annual pilgrimages from many parts of Africa and Asia, gives him an opportunity to spread far and wide his faith and a knowledge of his political ideas. Whether he will attempt to bring Yemen under his control and whether his ambition to rule Arabia covers the whole peninsula seems uncertain at present. So much is evident, however, that Great Britain is aware of the advantage of friendly relations with him.

The western coast of the Red Sea is divided between Egypt, the Sudan, and Eritrea. The reservations of the British Proclamation of Egyptian Independence of 1922 make provision for the protection of the Egyptian Red Sea coast. In the Sudan, events have moved rapidly in the recent past. Prior to the Great War, its status was defined by the Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1899, which followed the re-conquest of the country by the joint efforts of the British and Egyptian armies. After the War, the dissatisfaction aroused over the handling of the recruiting for the Volunteer Camel Corps and the propaganda of the Egyptian Nationalists resulted in sporadic uprisings. In 1920, the Milner Commission made an investigation and recommended that, irrespective of any change in the relation between Great Britain and Egypt, British control of the Sudan should not be affected. When Egyptian independence was declared, the question of the Sudan was reserved for further discussion. In the meantime, the *status quo* was to be maintained. In spite of Egyptian Nationalist claims, Great Britain has refused to give up the Sudan. The reasons are threefold: Egyptian mismanagement, the Nile, and the possibility of raising cotton. The murder of the Sidar in 1924 brought matters to a head. The Allenby Ultimatum of November 20th demanded the

withdrawal of all purely Egyptian military forces and the Egyptian officers of the Arab-Sudanese units, the creation of a Sudanese Defense Force, which should take the oath of allegiance only to the Governor General, and the withdrawal of all opposition to Great Britain's desire to protect foreign interests in Egypt. To these demands Egypt yielded. In consequence, Great Britain has gained two great advantages: viz-, the control of an additional portion of the Red Sea coast, and the ability to check any attempt of the French to establish direct contact with western Abyssinia from the west and through her with the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean. The Darfur frontier between French Equatorial Africa and the Sudan was settled by the Protocol of January, 1924.

The Italian colony of Eritrea extends from the Sudan to the Bab-el-Mandeb. Yemen lies opposite to it. In Eritrea Mussolini is encouraging the settlement of Italian colonists. With Yemen he has recently negotiated a commercial treaty. It appears that he is endeavoring to secure a strong position in the southern portion of the Red Sea. Whether he purposes to develop his advantage into anything more than the ability to bargain, remains to be seen. It is known, of course, that he smarts under the post-war distribution of the German colonies in Africa. The annexation of Jubaland to Italian Somaliland in 1920 has not satisfied his aspirations.

It is a curious fact that the Powers maneuvering for position at the Strait of Gibraltar, with the exception of Spain, are seeking to control also the Bab-el-Mandeb. Italy, France, and Great Britain hold territory there. In 1802 Great Britain made a treaty with the Sultan of Aden. In 1829, British ships took over the city and the surrounding territory under instructions from the Government of Bombay. British Somaliland has interested the British since the signing of a treaty between the Governor of Zeila and the East India Company in 1840, in which the Governor agreed not to cede the adjoining coast to a foreign power. After the revolt of the Mahdi in 1884, Great Britain declared a protectorate over Somaliland. Napoleon III took Obok in 1862, and in 1885 France extended her influence over the neighboring coast. French Somaliland with Djibuti, the terminus of the Abyssinian Railway, lies directly opposite Aden. Italy has been expanding her influence in Eritrea since 1885. In the Strait itself Great Britain holds the Island of

Perim, which she first occupied in 1799. After giving it up a few months later, she finally took it over in 1857. France, on the other hand, established an interest in the Territory of the Sheik Said in 1868 through the purchase of land by a number of merchants from Marseilles. During the Franco-Prussian War these merchants were obliged to withdraw. In doing so, however, they did not give up their claims. As late as 1900, a Frenchman by the name of Hugues Le Roux visited the Territory. So far as the Bab-el-Mandeb is concerned, France holds territory on both sides, while Great Britain has Aden and the Island of Perim. A serious conflict of vital interests of the two great Colonial Powers will, undoubtedly, throw this Strait into high relief.

Abyssinia, though deprived of direct access to the sea, plays an important part in the question of communication between the West and the East. It is the only independent state in eastern Africa. In 1905, when Germany obtained commercial concessions from Menelik more advantages than those granted to other Powers, Great Britain, France, and Italy became alarmed. Consequently, they signed a treaty on December 13th of the following year, in which they jointly guaranteed the political and territorial *status quo* in "Ethiopia." In conformity with this treaty, Great Britain and Italy signed an agreement in regard to the damming of the waters of Lake Tsana by British interests and the building of an Italian railway from Eritrea to Italian Somaliland. This railroad is to cross Abyssinia west of Addis Abeba. If the information at our disposal is correct, this agreement was drawn up without consulting France,—a violation, it would seem, of Article 4 of the treaty. Is it possible that the Anglo-Italian Agreement of 1926 bears the same relation to French interests in Abyssinia as the Anglo-French Secret Articles of 1904 bore to German interests in Morocco? Whatever the reasons for the accord between Italy and Great Britain, it can not be denied that the construction of the Italian railroad, together with the Sudan, will form a double line of defense against any attempt of France to establish a liason between her Mediterranean possessions and her Somaliland Protectorate via the Sahara and Equatorial Africa. She must seek direct access to the Indian Ocean in some other way.

If the foregoing analysis of the Mediterranean situation is correct, there can not be any doubt that the interests of European

Powers along this important waterway conflict at many points. Wherein, then, lies the menace? Obviously, this must lie in the possibility of the development of an acute situation between minor Powers into which the great Colonial Empires may be drawn because of their commitments, or it must lie in the possibility of a serious altercation between a major and a minor Power, which will involve other Powers. There is a third possibility. Since the destruction of the German Empire and the exclusion of Austria-Hungary from the Adriatic, the great natural rivals in the Mediterranean are the two Colonial Empires whose homelands are located on the Atlantic Seaboard. The Mediterranean interests of the one are "perpendicular", those of the other are "horizontal". It is, certainly, not too much to say that a realization of this fact is involved in the discussions concerning the limitation of submarines, aeroplanes, and cruisers.

HUGO C. M. WENDEL

THE WELFARE OF AMERICAN INTERESTS IN MEXICO AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION

Among the anomalies that the history of the past hundred years has brought forth, none is more remarkable perhaps than the relationship that has arisen between the United States and its neighbors to the southward. Here in the New World are twenty-one republics; all imbued with the spirit of liberty born of emancipation from former motherlands in Europe; all regarded as independent, sovereign nations, and yet placed in a situation where one of them has become supreme over the rest.

The position held by the United States is not due to superiority in size, population, wealth, prestige and enterprise alone. These elements of power have been reinforced by a singularly elastic political maxim, called the Monroe Doctrine, which the more it is stretched so as to cover particular cases, the tighter become its bonds upon those to whom it is applied. The efficacy of that maxim in turn has been strengthened by a sentiment termed Pan-Americanism. In theory a recognition of mutuality of concern among the twenty-one republics, in practice it seems rather to be an agency for diffusing the ideas and institutions of the United States.

Were this not enough, most of the republics known collectively as "Latin America" are members of the League of Nations. Association with that body has enhanced presumably their international importance. But it appears to have accomplished no visible change in the situation over against their northern neighbor. To this factor and to the others preceding must be added, finally, the many assurances emanating from both official and private sources in the United States that this country of ours cherishes no designs upon its fellow republics prejudicial to their liberty, their independence and their sovereignty.

As one of our former Presidents once observed, it is a "condition and not a theory" that confronts us. That condition is the actual supremacy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Elsewhere on earth a balance of power determines more or less the relationship among nations. Here there is no such equilibrium, and there can not be so long as one country is able to dominate its fellows. To what extent and under what circumstances it may

exercise power of the sort constitutes for the republics affected a source of constant misgiving.

Among Latin Americans and Europeans certain notions are prevalent which have made but scant headway among our own people. They believe that the course of events during the past thirty years in particular reveals a tendency toward converting the region that lies between the Rio Grande and the Straits of Magellan into a vast zone of present and prospective influence for the United States. Some Latin Americans go so far as to declare that, like ancient Gaul, it is divisible for this purpose into three parts: the "sphere of potential coercion", represented by the small republics in and around the Caribbean; the "sphere of potential menace", coterminous with Mexico; and the "sphere of potential ascendency", comprising the countries of South America. The European viewpoint is summed up apparently in the fantastic definition bestowed upon the Monroe Doctrine in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Here it is put into the category of "regional understandings" —a euphemistic designation for spheres of interest, such as the powers of the Old World have carved out for themselves everywhere except in America. The exception is significant. It befits a popular interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, to the effect that, since the United States should not meddle in European concerns, so Europe must refrain from interference in American affairs.

On this broad background of relationship to our southern neighbors, it becomes manifest that American interests in Mexico and the Caribbean area are far more complex and correspondingly more difficult to handle than those ordinarily found in the realm of international politics and economics. Countries other than the United States have means of communication and outlying possessions to guard. They have investments of their nationals and of foreigners to protect in what are esteemed the backward regions of the globe. Their process of development has forced them, as it has compelled our own land, to turn from the promotion of internal activities into fields of expansion abroad. Their countrymen, like ours, have migrated thither, bearing with them the brain, the brawn and the capital requisite for utilizing resources that had long lain dormant. Certain obligations thus have been entailed upon the homelands which in essence are much the same as those which have befallen

the United States. But none of their problems is comparable in nature and implication with the one that faces our own country.

What differentiates the welfare of American interests in Mexico and the Caribbean region from those of European lands is the international American tradition associated with the maintenance of republican government, liberty, independence, sovereignty and mutuality of concern in safeguarding all of these rights from aggression by foreigners. Diverse as their respective origins were, when once freedom from external control had been attained, a certain understanding and sympathy arose between the United States and its fellows which has sought expression ever since. The attachment formed a hundred years and more ago, so wholly unlike anything found in other continents, can not be broken, because it has become an integral part of inter-American consciousness.

Although at the time the United States recognized the independence of the colonies once belonging to Spain and Portugal and issued the Monroe Doctrine, it proffered neither alliance nor protection to the new nations, the idea was implanted nevertheless that basically our sentiments and interests were identical with theirs. Repeatedly emphasized, it took deep root in the minds of all Americans who give thought to the welfare of their respective countries. European governments, operating within their dependencies in Africa, Asia and Oceania, might do as they chose with reference to the fortunes of the folk who dwelt there, because no such traditions and no such attitudes of mutual concern existed to inhibit their action. The government of the United States, on the other hand, is restrained by the force of moral and sentimental considerations arising out of historical antecedents which render the adoption of a definitive policy toward the Latin-American republics, and in particular toward those closest to our own shores, exceedingly difficult.

That closeness operates as both a cause and an effect. Out of it have proceeded political and economic interests that have brought on serious complications. Due to these in turn the charge of imperialism has been levelled at the United States. The degree in which it may be justifiable can be determined by surveying certain specific issues and studying the implications to which they give rise.

In 1917 the Republic of Mexico saw fit to promulgate a constitution that seems to menace the retention of private property in land by foreigners. In so doing it exercised the right possessed by every

independent, sovereign state to change its fundamental law. Before that date it was permissible for foreigners to purchase or lease both the surface and the subsoil of lands containing certain classes of mineral or other deposits, among which was petroleum. The new constitution, however, vests the ownership of all such property in the nation; and the laws enacted under it provide, under penalty of forfeiture for non-compliance, that rights of the sort shall be replaced by concessions confirmatory of them.

The statesmen who framed the instrument sought to remove conditions that, in their belief, had impeded the national development of the country and kept the mass of its inhabitants in poverty and ignorance. Hence the resources with which nature has endowed Mexico should be held no longer at the disposal of foreigners who invest their money in enterprises productive of great profit to themselves and of small advantage for Mexicans.

To the assertion of such a principle no reasonable objection could be raised. The trouble lies simply in the question whether a process of enforcement would make its effects retroactive and confiscatory.

Protesting against so radical an alteration in the status of ownership, individuals and corporations concerned claim that what they bought or otherwise acquired in legal form prior to 1917 should be retained by them accordingly. What they consider a good title they do not wish to exchange for a concession. At all events, they perceive no satisfactory reason why they should subject it to official scrutiny and possible voidance.

Coming to the defense of its nationals, the government of the United States has declared that the procedure apparently contemplated by Mexico would violate well established rules of international law protecting the property of foreigners against arbitrary seizure. It holds that the regulations devised are made applicable to conditions prevailing before the constitution went into effect, and hence are confiscatory in nature.

The government of Mexico, on its part, maintains that it has no intention whatever of depriving anyone of property rights lawfully acquired. It insists, however, that the nation itself, and not individuals or corporations, shall be the title-holder. In its judgment, the regulations for enforcing the constitution are neither retroactive nor confiscatory. What they do is, to provide a confirma-

tion of existing privileges by means of official concessions freely granted, which will guarantee their validity and assure to the grantee the utilization of the property concerned, precisely as if it continued to be held in fee simple or on private lease. This arrangement it regards as no denial of any essential right.

In substance, then, the point at issue between Mexico and the United States is, whether the action in prospect is confiscatory or not. It raises a justiciable question suitable for submission to an arbitral or other international court. Should that body decide the Mexican procedure to be confiscatory, it would assess damages accordingly.

Judicial proceedings of the sort could not involve an inquiry into the right of Mexico to enact the legislation against which complaint had been raised. So long as the political thought of the world continues placing nations with reference to one another in a position different from that of individuals, and making them responsible to no law except that of their own creation, no independent, sovereign state would allow the exclusive jurisdiction it enjoys within its national borders to be passed upon by an authority external to itself. In this respect, theoretically at least, there is no choice between Mexico and our own country and all other nations. For, as an American humorist remarked in this general connection, each of them is so sure that it is right that it would be unwilling to let anyone else decide in its favor!

Whether a given state is able physically to exercise, as well as theoretically to claim, complete power of control over its internal affairs and over all persons within its jurisdiction, foreigners and nationals alike, is a problem that has found many an illustration in the Caribbean region during the past thirty years. The most conspicuous example of it at present is that furnished by the Republic of Nicaragua. Here the matters in dispute have not been handled through the ordinary methods of diplomacy, or considered as at all suitable for reference to some international body, but by a resort to force. Instead, however, of the nation enjoying a right to employ it within, compulsion has been applied from without in such a manner that there is no enjoyment for any of the parties concerned. Rather than allow an independent, sovereign nation to settle internal controversies as it thinks best, the United States, a foreign country, undertakes their adjustment.

Were the situation in Nicaragua not one of actual bloodshed, it would be ludicrous. The action taken by the United States certainly recalls, with appropriate modification, the soliloquy of Hamlet: To intervene or not to intervene, and an ancient nursery rhyme as well, about "half a mile in and half a mile out"! A vice president of the republic has been driven from the country by a revolution that had forced the president to resign. Entitled under the national constitution to the presidency, he seeks to vindicate his title through the sole means left at his command and familiar in Caribbean annals: that of taking a gun and going into politics! What prompted him to do so, however, was the fact t hat the government of the United States had accorded recognition to an individual elected to the executive office by a pliant congress after his immediate predecessor, the prime mover in the revolution, had failed to win that boon. The chief reason alleged for this procedure was the duty of protecting foreign life and property against possible injury. But instead of doing what a European nation placed in similar circumstances conceivably might have done, of suppressing peremptorily by force all opposition to its choice of occupant for the presidential chair, this country of ours orders a number of neutral zones to be set up in Nicaragua. Outside of them the Liberals may war at will with the Conservatives. Inside of them fighting is to be prevented by American troops, lest the occupant of the presidential chair in question lose his balance!

This species of military abstention, applied to a Caribbean republic, has proved to be no more efficacious, it would seem, in curbing the pugnacious instinct there than has prohibition of another sort in producing alcoholic abstinence in the land of their joint origin. The Nicaraguans, at all events, have persisted in the practice of national self-determination, as they understand that expression, with regard to the selection of a chief executive. That they have clung to this mode of action so long in the face of stern disapproval and even of menace from the mighty neighbor to the northward might argue that the real choice of the people is not the person who sits within the hedgerow of American bayonets.

Regardless of whether prolonged diplomatic interchanges or armed quasi-intervention be the method employed by the United States for dealing with the two neighbors to the southward, its conduct has been denounced at home and abroad as imperialistic

Our own people have been disposed at times to hurl that opprobrious adjective at powers across the waters, because of the conduct that they have displayed in their several spheres of influence. But we do not relish having it made a boomerang that comes hurtling back into the area that they look upon as *our* sphere of influence.

What is imperialism? Does it mean the same thing to them as it does to us? Does it refer to the settlement of the nationals of a given country and the investment of their capital in the territory of peoples unable to prevent the entry of either, if they so desired? Does it connote necessarily the forcible or the peaceable annexation of such territory? Does it arise also when the government of the country in question intervenes by arms, or through strong political pressure in some other form, to protect the lives and property of its citizens who, in the eyes of the peoples concerned, are entitled to no more or greater rights and privileges than are enjoyed by the local inhabitants?

What appears to distinguish imperialism from settlement and investment merely, are the factors of annexation and of actual or potential control. With the exception of what was acquired from Mexico eighty years ago, the United States has not taken by force any territory belonging to a Latin-American republic, though it has acquired some by peaceable means. For three quarters of a century, moreover, after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, it did to Mexico, the Caribbean region and further southward none of the things that it has done since 1898. From that year onward it has widened steadily the scope of its territorial, economic and political influence; and simply could not help doing so. When the saturation-point in its internal development had been reached at the close of the last century, surplus energy hitherto pent up, sought and found in Mexico and the Caribbean area an immediate, and in South America an ultimate, outlet in addition to those available in other parts of the world.

If, therefore, imperialism signifies the successive enlargement of political pressure in accordance with a necessitous demand for the protection of Americans and their property located in Latin-American republics where conditions are more or less backward or unstable or a nationalistic spirit is rife, then the charge of imperialism can hardly be refuted, even if denied as intentional. Because, just to the extent that an application of political pressure

affects the right of independent, sovereign nations to manage their internal affairs unhindered and unafraid, just so far is that right impugned or impaired and their destiny made subject to the will of the foreigner. Herein again emerges the difference between the situation in spheres of influence outside of the New World and that presented by the relationship of Mexico, the republics of the Caribbean and, constructively, those of South America, to this country. Herein again appears the extraordinary problem that confronts the United States. What sort of a policy can it adopt that will be consistent with its duty to its nationals, with a maintenance of entire respect for the independence and sovereignty of its fellow nations of America, and with loyalty to the traditions of sympathy and good will prevailing ever since all of them won their freedom from foreign domination? 'Twould be a marvellous feat of sleight-of-hand on the part of an American Secretary of State who could manage to keep these three considerations evenly balanced!

Constantly influential upon the conduct of the government of the United States toward the republics of Latin America are the spirit and attitude of our people toward their fellows to the southward. Although the earlier sentiment of real community of interests and problems in the face of possible menace from abroad hurtful to the welfare of youthful nations has lost doubtless much of its intensity, the remembrance of it lingers; but it has become mingled with certain other states of mind. One of them is the big-brotherly feeling which would obligate the citizens of the oldest and strongest of the American republics to protect and safeguard the younger and weaker. Another is the missionary sense of duty to aid the less fortunate, correcting if need be their faults and guiding them toward the goal of general prosperity. A third is the business instinct of Americans which urges the conversion of neglected resources into "bigger and better" products useful to mankind at large.

In consequence of the operation of all these forces, and under the aegis of a Monroe Doctrine that has virtually no limit to its interpretation, the United States has undertaken a fourfold task of protection of certain of the Latin-American republics, with prospects of its extension to others: against aggression from outside of the New World; of American citizens against injury to their persons and property from internal legislation or commotion; of foreigners

threatened from the same sources; and of the republics themselves against the results of what may be deemed their faults or misfortunes. If the performance of this function by the American government imposes restrictions—as it must in greater or less degree—upon the theoretically exclusive right of the republics concerned to administer their affairs as they think best, a system of tutelage follows. No matter how benevolent the assurance that the procedure is designed wholly for their own good, the people of those states are inclined to believe rather that the tutor also profits somewhat from his altruism; and they chafe under restraints that wound their consciousness of nationhood.

What especially galls the Latin-American republics is the apparent fact that the United States has assumed toward them the rôle of the European nations which, in accordance with a common but mistaken interpretation, the Monroe Doctrine was supposed to forfend. As one of our former Secretaries of State has explained our more recent procedure under that tenet, "what we will not permit the great powers of Europe to do...we will not permit any American republic to make it necessary for the great powers of Europe to do," even while we disclaim any intention to regard Latin-American countries as "subjects for future colonization", to extend our political "system to any portion of this hemisphere", or to attempt "any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny"! Have the condition of being "dangerous to our peace and safety" and the "manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States", of which the language of the old Doctrine further speaks, become shifted from the powers of Europe to the Latin-American republics themselves?

At this point, more perhaps than elsewhere, the anomaly of the relationship between this country and its fellow nations stands out. Disregarding a plea that the procedure of the "Colossus of the North", as they have christened it, is due far more to conditions produced by the enormous disparity in strength and advancement which has grown up between them and ourselves during the course of a century, than to anything whatever that might resemble deliberate encroachment, they raise the cry of "Yankee hypocrisy"! It is a mistaken, as well as an unfair, cry. At best the conduct of the United States toward Mexico and the little countries of the

Caribbean is attributable simply to the inexorable logic of a situation created by the relativity of national development. Nor is there any valid basis for doubt about the genuineness of our declarations of respect for their rights and privileges, their international equality, dignity, sovereignty, independence and all the rest. The point of the matter is, that the officials who determine the action of our government, like the people whom they represent, are ever mindful of the traditional relationship between their country and its southern neighbors, even while they endeavor to make new modes of action that are rendered unavoidable by new exigencies, political and economic, conform to it. At worst, we are merely deceiving ourselves.

Rather than admit openly that the force of circumstances compels this country to adopt a course of regulation for the affairs of our immediate neighbors in their interest and our own, the government of the United States resorts to a variety of devices which have that effect, but do not mention such a purpose or define them as parts of a policy. Among such devices are the recognition or nonrecognition of presidents, the levying or the lifting of an embargo on the shipment of arms, the severance of diplomatic relations and the employment of military intervention, without calling it by that name. So great, moreover, is our popular dislike for exhibitions of imperialism and so imbued are our government and fellow citizens with the thought of what the relationship between the southern republics and ourselves is presumed to exemplify, that we seek theoretically to reconcile what practically is irreconcilable.

We certainly do not wish to wound the susceptibilities of our Latin-American neighbors. We shrink no less from the criticism of "those imperialistic nations" overseas, that we are applying in our American "sphere of influence" virtually the same methods as they do in theirs, pretend as we may to the contrary. Yet we persist in believing that we are not as they are.

In striving to assure the welfare of American interests in Mexico and the Caribbean region the United States can not serve both actuality and tradition. Whenever it applies force or some other kind of publicly-known political pressure to the republics there, it has to start explaining the reasons for the gap that yawns between professions of good will and the performance of deeds that are denounced as indicative of the opposite. Unless, therefore,

we are to continue with a makeshift for a policy, which deceives no one but ourselves, we must choose some course of action which will remove the one and create the other.

Since neither this country nor Mexico is a member of the League of Nations, and since no protection against American interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine is vouchsafed the latter country and the republics of the Caribbean, a resort to the international tribunal set up under the auspices of that body, as a means of adjusting differences between ourselves and our southern neighbors, is unlikely. There remains the court of arbitration at The Hague. But as this is located in Europe and is presumed to furnish compromises rather than to render decisions or effect reconciliations, it does not seem adaptable altogether to the traditions prevailing among the members of the family of American nations.

In lieu of either of these oversea agencies, accordingly, there might be established by agreement between the United States and the principal republics of South America, or a larger group if need be, an Inter-American Commission of Inquiry and Conciliation, to which should be submitted all disputes between the United States and its fellows, as well as between Latin-American countries themselves, which can not be settled through the regular channels of diplomacy. Under its auspices an investigation into the sources and nature of the controversies might be conducted and recommendations made for their adjustment.

Were such a plan adopted and made effective in operation, it would serve a number of useful objects. It would tend to abate among Latin Americans suspicion of American designs upon their liberties and fortunes and nullify the cynicism of the powers overseas. Through its agency the United States would be enabled to square its protestations of respect for the rights and privileges of its fellow nations with the exigencies that its interests among them might bring forth, and impart new life to the traditions of friendship and community of feeling among the twenty-one republics of the New World.

Those interests of ours are not political and economic alone. They are inseparable from the many other phases of relationship which location in the same hemisphere, a mutuality of historical heritage and the sharing of time-honored memories have engendered. Assurance of their welfare is a common obligation of all the Americas!

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD

THE NEW WORLD HISTORY*

There is a new World History, because there is a new World Community. The progress of science has created this community in which interdependence is constantly increasing. It came and developed unbidden and irrespective of the wishes or even the foresight of men, making us all today citizens of the world, whether we like it or not. Inevitably, the number and range and complexity of international problems have increased, and men have sought to define and study them, dealing with such fields as the development of international law and the methods of diplomacy, imperialism in its various aspects, nationalism, international trade with its intricate ramifications, and organization for the management of international business and the promotion of world peace. Gradually we have come to recognize that we can profitably study the origins and development of the World Community—its history.

It would be an interesting experiment to attempt a history of humanity with the gradual enlargement of community interest and organization as its central theme. Such a story would include the teamwork of primitive men, from the hunting pack to the tribal unit; the growth of city states and of kingdoms; the rise of great empires, culminating in the West with Rome and the Pax Romana; the political disintegration and social decay of Western civilization, followed by a gradual recovery; the building of the modern states east and west and of such striking groups as the American Union, the British Empire, and the German Republic; and the various international agencies, of which the League of Nations is the most conspicuous. Yet this story could not be adequately studied in terms of political organization merely, for not only are the moving causes of development economic and social very largely, but communities can and do exist with little or no political machinery, as in the case of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and most strikingly of all in the World Community itself.

In the making of the World Community of today two great developments have played the determining parts: the expansion of Europe over-seas and the development of applied science. Down to the fifteenth century of the Christian era the contacts of Europe

*This paper appears in The Historical Outlook for October, 1927.

with the Eastern world beyond the Levant were few and indirect, the American centers of culture were completely isolated from both Europe and the East, and Africa, beyond a northern belt, was but slightly known either to Europe or to Asia. All this changed rapidly in the remarkable era of European voyages of discovery leading to an immense extension of the contacts of peoples and cultures through commerce, conquest, migration, religion, and adventure. Henceforth there was a world stage for the human drama.

The beginning of the Industrial Revolution in eighteenth century England, following the relatively few but important earlier scientific discoveries and inventions, marked the direct advent of an age of invention and applied science, a scientific revolution which has transformed the world. This era has become peculiarly an age of integration, of ever-closer interdependence, in which the size of this planet has in effect been steadily shrinking, the common interests of its peoples growing more numerous and closely-knit, the world itself a neighborhood. "For the first time in the annals of our planet its inhabitants have become one whole, a community each and every part of which is affected by the fortunes of every other part. . . . Thus have all men been forced to feel that the parts of the world have grown into one, for weal or for woe; thus comes it that now for the first time the History of the World in the full sense of the word can begin to be written."[1]

The rise of this World Community naturally led to serious studies by scholars seeking to collect and organize and interpret facts, to define problems and suggest solutions. It is no accident that the famous work of Hugo Grotius, the first treatise on the dealings of nations with each other, the basis of modern international law, should have appeared in the early seventeenth century, when the expansion of Europe was well under way. During the generation just past, and especially since the World Community was so terribly revealed by the lurid light of the World War and its aftermath, there has been a veritable flood of books and articles on international relations, international trade, world politics, nationalism, imperialism, problems of war and peace, with a few definite efforts to begin the writing of the new world history. The history of the writing of world history would itself make an interesting and illuminat-

[1]James Bryce, *World History*, the Raleigh Lecture for 1919, Oxford University Press.

ing story, if adequately told and interpreted. It must suffice here to point out that the new world history seeks to be fundamentally different in certain respects from the older general or universal history. Not only does it represent the general tendencies and characteristics of the "New History", but it seeks for world history a clearer unity and a more definite theme—the story of humanity and the development of the World Community.

The idea has been most effectively stated and advocated, not by a professional historian, but by an eminent novelist, Mr. H. G. Wells. He urges the conception of "history as the common adventure of all mankind," and declares that the story must be something quite different from "the history of England, plus the history of France, plus the history of Germany, plus the history of Russia, and so on. Universal history is at once something more and something less than the aggregate of the national histories to which we tare accustomed, and it must be approached in a different spirit and dealt with in a different manner."[2] Mr. Wells, attempting ir his amous *Outline* (1920) to write the new kind of world history, has been criticized severely both for weakness of scholarship and for an undue tendency to preach and moralize. Whatever its faults, however, the widely-read *Outline* has been enormously influential. As Professor C. J. H. Hayes[3] remarks, "his work is truly important, because its general synthetic airm is excellent, because it is timely, and because its author has a voice that 'carries.' Mr. Wells is preparing the way for scholars and making the world safe for historians."

Other thinkers had spoken before the distinguished novelist was heard, and the ideas which he so effectively exploits had previously been stated with clarity and vigor, though in voices not so widely heard among the populace, nor by those who conduct our schools. In 1913, Mr. F. S. Marvin published a really brilliant little volume called *The Living Past*, "a sketch of Western progress," in which he begins by "Looking Backward," includes chapters on "The Childhood of the Race," the rise of modern science, the Industrial Revolution and its meaning, the political and social revolutions that followed, and concludes by "Looking Forward." No chapters or sections are devoted to particular countries or states, but the grow-

---

[2]*Outline of History*, Preface, v-vi.

[3]Freeman, March 1921, p. 21.

ing unity of civilization is set forth as a living reality. Mr. Marvin declares that his clue "is no new discovery," and acknowledges his indebtedness to "Kant's theory of universal history as the growth of a world-community." Kant's vision was indeed remarkable. His *Idea of a Universal History* (1784) and *Eternal Peace* (1795), though written before the age of science, emphasize even in that day the close relationship and interlocking interests, political and commercial, of the states of Europe, while recognizing the problems raised by Europe's over-sea expansion, with its resulting rivalries and conflicts. He advocated for the first time a democratically controlled world state, in which the interests of individual men and states should be reconciled with those of all mankind.

In our own day no one has seen more clearly or stated more pointedly than Lord Bryce the basis and need for a new world history. Marvin, in the preface of his first edition of *The Living Past* (May 20, 1913), says: "The greatest encouragement which has occurred to me during the two or three years spent upon the book came at the close in Lord Bryce's address on April 3, 1913, as President of the International Congress of Historical Studies. It agrees so strikingly and in so many points with the view which I have suggested, that a few words must be quoted. 'The world,' he said, 'is becoming *one* in an altogether new sense.... More than four centuries ago the discovery of America marked the first step in the process by which the European races have now gained dominion over nearly the whole earth.... As the earth has been narrowed through the new forces science has placed at our disposal.... the movements of politics, of economics, and of thought, in each of its regions, become more closely interwoven.... Whatever happens in any part of the globe has now a significance for every other part. World History is tending to become One History.... The widening of the field is also due to a larger conception of History, which (through the aid of archaeology) now enables us faintly to discern the outlines of a process of slow and sometimes interrupted development of mankind in the Old World during a period, each one of the divisions of which is larger than all the time that has elasped since our first historical records begin."

In his Raleigh Lecture for 1919, previously quoted in this article, Lord Bryce develops these ideas and extends his discussion. He

contrasts the older narrative method of "pursuing the course of events first in one country and then in another," with a different "way of trying to present the History of Mankind as a whole, which escapes some of the difficulties incident to the plan of a number of distinct narratives dealing with different countries. It is to adopt what may be called a cultural instead of a geographical scheme. Select certain main lines of human activity more or less present in every nation" and try to trace progress or decline. He then proceeds to some discussion of main threads, of processes and forces, and of epochs, ending on the note of "Mankind has at last become a Community," with the "dignity of a common citizenship."

The growth of the World Community and the need for a new world history have been independently recognized and studied by others less known to the public, as they were independently recognized and formulated by Marvin and Bryce. The time was ripe for Mr. Wells' effective exploitation. A year later his *Outline* was followed by Van Loon's prize-winning juvenile, *The Story of Mankind* (1921), whose jaunty style and original illustrations won a wide circulation and contributed largely to popular interest in world history, though the book was almost entirely European in scope. In 1922 there appeared an English translation by Professor S. B. Fay of Eduard Fueter's scholarly *Weltgeschichte* (Zurich, 1921), as *World History, 1815-1920.* In 1926 came Professor Lynn Thorndike's *Short History of Civilization:* Dr. A. C. Flick's *Modern World History, 1776-1926,* "a survey of the origins and development of contemporary civilization"; and *The Human Adventure,* a trade edition of two excellent school textbooks, slightly revised, by Professors Robinson and Breasted. New editions appeared of several older manuals and series on general history. The significance of such works as Isaiah Bowman's *The New World* (1921), Hayes' *Essays on Nationalism* (1926), Moon's *Imperialism and World Politics* (1926), Marvin's *The Century of Hope* (1919), and Kay's *The Trend of History* (1922) is sufficiently evident.

What are the schools of the United States doing about the new world history? It may fairly be said that they are groping.

In the elementary schools there is scarcely a course anywhere to be found that could by any stretch of meaning be called a course in world history, or even stories illustrating the development of humanity, except that in some of the "European Background"

courses so common in the sixth grade there is perhaps as near an approximation as many high school classes attain in courses labelled "world history". In the junior high school American history is still the almost universal offering. The Second Committee of Eight (Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in Schools) intended to recommend a two-year survey of world history in grades seven and eight, but in timid deference to the inflamed nationalism of 1919 they named the course "American History in Its World Setting," urged "special emphasis upon our own contributions and problems," and in other ways stressed the American element. As a result there has been wide misunderstanding and the influence of the committee has been apparent chiefly in a somewhat greater emphasis upon the foreign relations of the United States or in more attention incidentally to important European development during the period of our national history. The absence of special textbooks in world history for these grades is sufficiently significant. Several interesting trade books for youthful readers have appeared, however, among them Hillyer's *Child's History of the World* (Century Co., 1924) and Happold's *The Adventure of Man* (Harcourt, 1926).

In the senior high school a very different condition prevails. World history courses, usually one year in length, but sometimes a year and a half or two years, are frequently found about the tenth grade level. These courses are increasing in number and textbooks are multiplying impressively.[4] A few interesting experiments are being worked out.[4] Yet it cannot be said that the high schools have really caught the idea of the new world history. Both the courses and the textbooks remain in nearly all cases overwhelmingly European in content and point of view, while the reasons for introducing them are in many cases utterly reactionary. Any one who has the opportunity of visiting schools and making inquiries will soon learn that very often the new course is introduced simply to cover as much ground as possible in the one year of history other than American which is offered, and that the exigencies of a commercial or technical curriculum or the conflicting demands

[4]See D. C. Knowlton's "History and the Other Social Studies in the Tenth Grade," HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, February, 1926; and J.M. Gambrill, *Experimental Curriculum-Making in the Social Studies* (McKinley Pub. Co., 1924).

of other social studies are the real explanation, rather than any recognition of a World Community or of the need for a new world history. Such a practice is simply a reversion of the old "general history" so vigorously attacked a generation ago and for many years so completely discredited. Such a change is not progressive, but reactionary, however much it may superficially seem to conform to a current fashion. When the substance of two or three years' work under the Committee of Seven program is crammed into a highly condensed epitome for one year it is no wonder that children gag and the course is sometimes such a failure that it has to be dropped from the curriculum.

If world history is to justify its place in the high school curriculum it must be fairly representative in treatment and point of view of thee *new* world history, which Bryce and Marvin and Wells have explained and justified, not of the old and discredited "general history." While Europe must continue to play a very prominent part in the story, because of the extraordinary Europeanization of the world which began with the age of discovery and still continues, we must not distort the dicture by giving our attention exclusively to Europe, even though we also have something to say of its contacts with other continents. In particular, the rich and important and ancient cultures of Asia must receive some sympathetic study. The United States (and the other American countries) must be recognized as after all a part of the world, sharing its fortunes and experiencing many of the same fundamental developments. It is essential that we give up our devotion to comprehensive epitomes and abstract generalizations, limit our topics and periods according to the time at our disposal for really fruitful study, and supply a reasonably adequate body of concrete reading and graphic material. The relation of the world history course to the separate American history and "Problems" courses now commonly offered should be carefully studied, and consideration should be given to the rich possibilities of correlation with other fields (literature, fine arts, music, natural science, industrial arts) which the study of the "new history" offers, and indeed requires for the best results. Point of view is absolutely vital—it must not be regional or national or racial or religious, but as objectively as possible the outlook of the World Community. An interesting problem for study is the

possible development of a common core that might be embodied in world history courses in the schools of all countries.[5]

Whether world history should in some form and in some way be taught in the elementary school, whether its chief place should be in the junior or the senior high school, are questions that cannot be taken up here, though it may be said unhesitatingly that teachers at all levels should know something about world history and understand its viewpoint. It should certainly have at least one place of importance, intelligently chosen, in every program for the social studies. In addition to the values we expect from the study of history in general, world history has its own special contributions to make. Toe point of view wihch it may develop and foster is invaluable, and it may aid uniquely in promoting knowledge and deeper understanding of the World Community in which we all live.

J. Montgomery Gambrill

---

[5]Comenius in the seventeenth century had the idea of a common book of knowledge, including history, for all peoples. The idea fascinates H. G. Wells, who develops it at length in two chapters entitled "The Bible of Civilization," in his *Salvaging of Civilization* (1921), wherein he argues for "a standard World History for general use in the world's schools" to be prepared by "historians from all the civilized peoples of the world." Professor Henry Johnson in his chapter of Dawson's *Teaching the Social Studies* (1927) demands a "world history of the world,.....one world history for all children of the world" (pp. 232-233), a proposal which he advocated in a local conference in Illinois many years ago.

CONTENT OF WORLD HISTORY COURSES IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

An American anthropologist visited the marvelous ruins of Central America, which rival the pyramids on the Nile. Upon reaching the ancient temples and palaces his guide introduced him to the old Indian chieftain who rules over that region. After inviting him to sit down for a *pow wow* the old warrior asked him: "Where do you live?" "Well, I live in a great city called Chicago" replied the visitor. "Chicago? Chicago? I never heard of Chicago! Where is Chicago?" demanded the red man. "If you take your swiftest pony" said the traveller, "turn his head towards the north star and ride in that direction for three moons, and then turn his head towards the rising sun and ride in that direction for three more moons, you will at last come to Chicago, where I live". The old chief meditated a few moments and then looking up with amazement and pity written on his face exclaimed, "Well! Well! How far do you live away from the center of the world!"

Most of us, I fancy, are like that old Indian. Our own little work room or playground is for us the center of the world. It takes some great upheaval like a World War to arouse us to a larger horizon of interest and sympathy. Anatole France said that what most men want in history is only the stupidities with which we are already acquainted and not a fresh insight or an original idea.

That a new world has emerged to challenge our conquest needs no labored academic proof. The local outlook of the 18th century man has expanded to include humanity. As trite as the axiom that $2+2=4$ is the assertion that the whole world has become a neighborhood and despite community jangles is in the process of becoming a brotherhood. Almost every mail brings an appeal to join some cause for the betterment of mankind, and a thousand new interests make demands on our intelligence. Our duties and responsibilities are widening and deepening. Old yardsticks, values and practices are undergoing modifications. On all sides we hear that religion, morals, economics, statesmanship and education must be altered to solve the new problems. With the shifting of these old centers of control, outgrown judgments and restrainst are being discarded and progressive educators are groping about frantically for reformed school and college curricula which will better fit our

youth for a creative life in an age that is scientific, industrial, and tremendously complex.

The uncertainties which worry educators in general affect the teachers of the social studies in particular. There is a conviction that the old history with its worship of the past, with its stress on politics, diplomacy, war and constitutionalism, must be either modified or entirely displaced. Good politics may be bad economies and worse morals. Political history at best is but a partial view of civilization. Human nature, group relationships, and social intelligence supply us with the best guide yet discovered for human conduct and discipline.

On the assumption that it is now desirable to teach world history instead of the national, or regional, or periodic, or racial, or episodal types so current, what should the content of such a course be? Shall we revert to the general or universal history in vogue a generation ago? Or shall we continue to instruct our boys and girls in that kind of history which so successfully prepared our generation for the World War, but with a reformed and benevolent determination, to re-interpret it in terms of a better understanding of international relationships? Or shall we attempt to organize a world history fundamentally different from both general history and a revolutionized national or sectional history? Or shall we compromise on some feasible combination of national and world history?

The Committee of Five reported in 1910 that a questionnaire of 1900 showed that half of the schools answering were giving courses of from six months to a year in general history; but that during the decade from 1900 to 1910 there was a strong tendency to drop it. This course, still found here and there, was good so far as it went. It aimed to give a survey of the activities of political and ecclesiastical groups during the so-called historic period from Adam of Eden to Abraham Lincoln. Covering about 6000 years in strict chronology, it was largely descriptive of states and their clashing political interests but it did call attention now and then to changes and feebly pointed out progress. It was mostly conglomerate, scrap-book history, however, and merely tied together dynastic and ecclesiastical occurrences. It was predominantly political, with a few comments on cultural developments and religious clashes. It stressed wars and schisms; pictured kings and queens, feudal lords

and bishops, and popes and emperors; emphasized dates and names; was taken up with blatant gossip about trivial happenings; and made the study of history largely an exercise of memory. Geographically it was confined to the Mediterranean basin, and to western Europe with brief allusions to the New World, Asia and Africa. It was more remarkable for what it excluded than for what it included. It made little attempt at interpretation or synthesis, and such generalizations as were given were shallow and often misleading. But it did widen the student's horizon to some extent, gave him a glimmer of continuity and change, and taught a vague idea of unity. Clearly it is not this type of world history we now wish to see revived in our schools and colleges.

The more recently organized courses in history in our secondary schools present a distinct improvement in content. Although there is considerable diversity, yet the tendency seems to be to offer (1) a general survey of European history with something of a world outlook and (2) a course on American history with stress on the era of statehood and some attention to such foreign affairs as directly concern our nation. In the colleges the beginning courses usually cover the history of Europe and its expansion but seldom reach the nineteenth century. A few experiments are being made in orientation courses on contemporary civilization with an historical background. Following these preliminary courses students are offered for election a variety of historical attractions reflecting no doubt the 400 different textbooks now available on history. It should be remembered that the majority of students in both schools and colleges take no more history than is required for graduation.

Does the student who takes the minimum, or even the maximum, obtain that conception of world history which he should have? If not, just what is lacking? In too many instances it may be said:

1. That the *viewpoint* is too provincial and too partial because it usually presents but a portion of the picture of the human race and leaves little impression of the world as a whole.

2. That the *perspective* is rather misleading for, while it shows a continuity, that continuity omits the larger portion of mankind and covers only a small part of man's evolution.

Geology ranges over millions of years. Is it impossible for history to cover a mere fraction of that time?

3. That the *emphasis* is often misplaced because the impression is given that certain nations or races have contributed more to world civilization than is actually true and that certain movements or periods are more significant than a wider survey carefully made would justify. Moreover proportionately more time is devoted to ancient and mediaeval life than to an intelligent study of our own age. There is too much reverence for the wisdom that is remote. The greatest profit in studying the past is derived from an understanding of the processes of the evolution of ideas and institutions which preceded and determined our own civilization, and not from court gossip, diplomatic intrigues and party trickery.
4. That a *biased judgment* in dealing with other peoples, periods and movements too frequently results from a restricted study and interpretation, and that a sympathetic understanding is not sufficiently cultivated.
5. That the *content* is too narrow and too inadequate. Commendable efforts have been made, it is true, to supplement political with social and economic history, but, as a rule, it is poorly done, and the cultural and religious phases of man's life are almost wholly neglected.

If these strictures on the history courses as now taught in school and college are warranted, then it may be concluded that they are more or less too deficient in scope, content and interpretation to give students that comprehensive understanding of the whole evolution of man which they should obtain. Should we, therefore, insist upon new courses in world history with a widened and reorganized content—courses that present—

1. The so-called prehistoric period of man's origin and development.
2. The growth of all peoples on earth, with due regard for their relative importance, from the beginning of written records to the present, showing their social, economic, religious, cultural and political institutions—what Henri Berr calls "the evolution of humanity".

3. A shifting of emphasis so that relatively less time will be devoted to earlier world history and more to our own age.
4. The intergroup, interinstitutional and interepochal relationships and activities.
5. And a more thorough understanding of continuity, differentiation, cause and effect and unity throughout the whole.

My own convictions as to the need of world history are firm, but I am in no iconoclastic mood. So much progress has been made during recent years in the better preparation of teachers and in improved syllabi and textbooks that it does not seem to me necessary to tear down to the ground all we have constructed and then rebuild according to brand new plans and specifications. Can we not take what we have, make such alterations and additions as seem necessary, and thus accomplish our purpose? Is it not far more important to inoculate our history teachers themselves with the virus of a world vision than to plan new courses? Will not such teachers put the right content into present courses, or modify them so that they will have the desired content?

What, then, are the essential qualifications for teachers of world history? They must have an intellectual familiarity with humanity as a whole from the beginnings to our day and understand the important actions, reactions and inter-actions throughout the entire past. They must comprehend the rise and growth of ideas and the materialization of those ideas in concrete institutions. They must differentiate the fundamental from the incidental or accidental. They must visualize the evolution of civilization in all its varied phases, and the persistence of the ancient world into the mediaeval world and both of them into the modern world. They must know history in a living manner and feel the influences of the East on the West and the West on the East, and how Europe has reached out over Asia, Africa and the New World, and in turn has been tremendously affected by those parts of the globe. They must understand how North and South America, Australia and South Africa, have been created by the overflow of Europe, Asia and Africa, and how this New World also greatly modified the Old World. They must feel that the United States is the product of in-

fluences from every nation in Europe, from Latin American and Canada, from Africa and Asia, and from Oceania. They must realize, as Professor Coolidge did twenty years ago, when he wrote his book on *The United States as a World Power*, the influences of our nation on the states of Latin America, Europe, Asia and Africa. They must see the genesis and persistence of certain forces, the continuity and spread of ideas and institutions, the differentiation and development of man in this continuing process, the operation of cause and effect everywhere, the unity of history both chronologically and laterally, and the capacity and inclination of man to cooperate in communities small and large. If teachers of history see and feel and know these facts of transcendent importance and are able to induce their pupils to interpret and synthesize them, then it makes little difference whether they are teaching ancient history, or mediaeval history, or modern history, or English history, or American history, for they will be putting world-history content into their history work.

The content of a subject is determined by its objectives. The outlook, the point of view, the orientation, the interpretation, the relationships, and the synthesis are what determine the vital and realistic content of any history course. Every fact should be studied in the light of all that precedes it, all that follows it, and all that affects it or is affected by it at the time of its occurrence. Continuity and unity are not to be dragged in at the end of a course but must be ever uppermost in the mind of student and teacher. Ideas, convictions and emotions of love, fear and hate are the most powerful factors in human conduct. Man thinks or believes and then acts. His acts, or those of others, generate new thoughts or emotions which are reflected in different actions. Groups—a family, a village, a state, a continent, a race, or a world—motivated by a common impulse translate feeling into deeds, which in turn provoke new ideas which again result in new deeds, and so on. A war originating in the Balkans spreads rapidly over Europe and then the earth, dividing humanity into two warring parties. The World War gives birth to new hopes which leads to new efforts. A suggestion for better phstal facilities in 1874 brings practically all nations into the Universal Postal Union and thereby makes inexpensive and speedy world communication a reality. Man's inventive genius aided by the spirit of cooperation conquers the sea, the air,

the desert and the mountain barrier. That teacher of history who sees international relationships together with their duties and needs as clearly as he comprehends national relationships together with their obligations and requirements will be able to put the content of world history into any course of history.

The true content of world history is humanity and its subject matter is the humanities. Is it not far more important for us to understand the development of the human race than it is to measure the planets or to unravel the mysteries of nature? World history alone explains human life with its endless diversities, its conquests, its defeats, its adventures, and its continuous striving for better and still better things. The co-operation of men in family, tribe, church state, industry and the world is a factor in the advance of civilization which has been disregarded in most of our history. Its study in world history is imperative, particularly in its political, social, economic and cultural aspects.

World history requires imagination, wide sympathies, and the capacity to weight evidence, to separate the true from the interesting, to see all sides of a problem and to view it from the point of view of another person, another race, and another age. Understanding and not merely knowing or cataloging is essential. It is necessary to trace development as a continuous genetic process and not as a series of dramatic catastrophies or cataclysms or a succession of repeating cycles. Ideas alone recur; events merely occur. Trends have greater educational value than mere happenings. History does not repeat itself—not even in newspaper offices. A President is reelected but his problems are always different. Indeed one of the practical uses of history is to keep us from repeating ourselves. That is why a historian cannot be a prophet although he deals with the prophets. Differences are more significant than resemblances because they work growth. The recognition of change, readjustment and development is the greatest lesson of history. Progress may be hastened somewhat by revolution but perhaps less than we think. Changes brought about by war are spectacular, but are not the most significant advances made during periods of peace? Think of the geographical discoveries, the Industrial Revolution, the rise of schools and universities, the creations of art, the great inventions, the doctrine of evolution,

progress of science, and the emancipation of slavery in Enland. The forward march of mankind is neither by a hop, skip and jump nor by handsprings, but by slow and steady plodding. One generation differs from another but each helps to interpret the other. The past is of value in helping us to explain and to understand our continually changing ideas and ideals, customs and institutions, and even ourselves; but the present is also an aid in exploring the past.

World history makes the human world in which we live more intelligible by showing our origins, our present problems, and the direction in which we are going. It enlarges our range of observation; steadies our heads to go forward; shows us our duties; increases our courage to slough off the archaic and useless; deepens our sympathies; broadens our charity; and improves our judgment. May not history become so practical that it will be of some positive service to the statesman, the professional man and the citizen? May we not hope in time to realize that "education for effective social membership" which is set forth as the goal by the latest committee of the American Historical Association on History and the other Social Studies?

If the destinies of man are to be determined more and more by groups of people in states, is it not desirable that our nation should know as much as possible about other nations in their international relations. If the United States is a world in itself, as many of our people believe, it is also a fraction of a larger world. How we shall employ our knowledge and the power based on it to meet our world obligations is of momentous consequence to humanity.

World history must observe the proportion of values. A tribe of Bushmen in Australia should not receive as much attention as the American Empire. The principality of Monaco should not be treated at as great length as Russia. The selection of material must be made on the basis of general and universal significance, and not local or provincial. The framework rather than the filling materials or ornaments should be set forth. Organization of essentials rather than brilliant narration is desirable, although clear, vivid, understandable exposition is a real asset. World history should present the great general facts of man's life on earth—a "sense of history as the common adventure of all mankind"—and trace the growth of ideas, opinions and attitudes of mind. Better study a

hundred great creative ideas than a thousand hatreds and fears' A world history which substitutes for a series of dramatic wars the explanation of social, political and cultural adjustment to ideals through changing environment and makes clear the processes by which every generation subordinates the common things to the great purposes of group growth will have a content of practical value. The purpose of world history should be to give our students an authoritative conception of the past which will enable them to comprehend in what they our present civilization grew out of the past, because this will show them what is dynamic and what is only dead timber inherited from the past. The totality of man's accomplishment constitutes the scope of world history. Thus it begins with man's origin in earliest days, it covers his political, social, economic, religious and cultural activities, and it includes all human beings on earth. It studies the forces which have made individuals and nations great in genuine accomplishments for the whole human race.

ALEXANDER C. FLICK

ATLANTIC CITY MEETING

November 26, 1927

VENETIAN ROOM, THE AMBASSADOR

Saturday Morning, November 26, 10 o'clock.

ADDRESSES—

"Phases of Fascism," Professor Herbert W. Schneider, Columbia University.

"The Place of Biography in the Teaching of History," Professor Roy F. Nicols, University of Pennsylvania.

Saturday Afternoon, November 26, 1 o'clock, Pompeiian Room, The Ambassador.

"Some Aspects of the Relations of Worker and Peasant in Soviet Russia," Professor J. Bartlet Brebner, Columbia University.

PHASES OF FASCISM

There is a dictionary, I am told, in which psychology is defined as "the various and varying obsessions of psychologists." Similarly fascism is best explained as the various and varying doings of fascisti. There are fascisti and fascisti. Fascism today is not that of yesterday, nor does any one know in what direction fascism will turn tomorrow. It changes with the political weather. Every country has its hard shell political orators and editors who are persistently consistent and have eternal principles. They go under defeated but not refuted. In our own country we are familiar with such individuals, but not with such parties. In Italy, the parties themselves became infected with moral principles and resolved to perish rather than to refashion their ideas. This fate has overtaken the opposition in Italy. It is the proverbial fate of those who fight for principles. The fascisti, on the other hand, like our own parties, fight for power; they manage to retain their government by adapting their minds to circumstances. Long ago Machiavelli taught that fortune, being a woman, loves the young and bold. And in Italy today the young and bold are called fascisti.

What I have to say, therefore, centers about two general themes: first, that fascism is changing continually; it is a movement, not a party; a government, not a doctrine. Second, that the real issues and conflicts are now within the movement and not between fascism and the opposition. As long as the opposition was alive, fascism showed a solid front to the foe, but now that the opposition is largely emigré, the internal differences are coming to the fore. Recently the cry was raised among those fascisti who were a little homesick for parliamentary debate, "How can we live without an opposition?" The answer was ready and obvious, "The opposition we have within us." Everyone now does lip-service to fascism, but each rolls his own brand. Everyone worships Mussolini, but his *own* Mussolini. Like God, Mussolini unites his warring children in theological union.

It is a common saying that there are as many fascisms as there are fascisti. I am therefore conscious of over-simplifying the facts in presenting to you only five major types. These are (1) squadrists, (2) ex-socialists and ex-republicans, (3) nationalists, (4) ideal-

ists, (5) syndicalists. I shall merely define the types, and leave you to calculate the permutations and combinations.

The squadrists are the so-called "original and only genuine" brand. A *fascio* is a band, group or club; a militant band is a squad. Literally fascisti are *banditi*. Probably nothing more would ever have been heard of these *fasci* had they not turned militant and violent. The squadrists fall into two general groups: (a) the *arditi* and *futurists*, (b) conservative liberals. The first group is constituted of war veterans who loved the war and saw no reason for not fighting out internal political issues in the same way in which they had fought out international ones. They supplied the volunteers for d'Annunzio's expedition on Fiume; they first wrecked socialist printing plants; they first wore black shirts and carried black banners. They are young adventurers whose violent patriotism is but one aspect of their general ardent romanticism. I cannot stop to describe political futurism. Suffice it to say that futurism in Italy is not confined to the so-called fine arts. The whole point of the movement is that the creative artistic spirit must break the bonds of the traditional arts. War is an art and a battle is literally a poem. The finest art must be acted, and the best stage for acting is war, politics and industry. For these realms are the greatest challenge to art; they are dominated by the dead weight of institutions and yet they are pre-eminently fields of action. Let artists rule! Under this slogan they launched forth with appropriate rites and costumes and began to "slay the past", as their phrase has it.

These knight-errants of the future were counter-balanced by a more business-like group of squadrists, whom I have called the conservative liberals. You probably are aware of the fact that in Italy the liberal-democrats are the conservatives and the champions of big business. The sons of factory owners and landed proprietors became squadrists when their fathers' property was menaced by the socialist local governments and by the communist national strikes. They frankly entered the field to protect their own interests. As the class war became more intense these upper class squadrists hired large numbers of the other type of squadrists, bona fide, disinterested soldiers of Italy, to fight with and for them. This led to those organized raids or punitive expeditions which finally broke up the red revolt. Occasionally bona fide squadrists

attempted the more positive tasks of government. But in this they were less successful. Squadrist government is best illustrated in the case of Florence, where in 1920 the notorious squadrist, Dumini, (later one of the Matteotti murderers) with Banchelli and other associates tried to govern the economic life of the city. They paraded the streets with signs "Prices must come down," and when prices refused to come down, merchants were beaten up and brought to a "military tribunal" where they were threatened with more drastic treatment. In the market place, as Banchelli characteristically says, the squadrists "planted the tri-color among the vegetables" and tried to force food prices down. They enjoyed a temporary success, but their funds were soon depleted and their upper class comrades refused to finance such tactics. In disgust the squadrists abandoned what they called the filthy political game and confined their efforts to occasional beatings and emergency murders.

The squadrist type of fascist has now officially disappeared from the scene. I say officially, for though there is practically no squadrism at present and though the government has repeatedly urged the regular police to use vigorous measures against recurrences of fascist violence, the squadrist nevertheless remains in the background of the fascist picture, hidden in the shadows, but a potential force and an ever present help in time of trouble.

The second general type of fascist I have mentioned is the ex-socialist or ex-republican politician. This is Mussolini's type. From the start his conception of fascism was political. He talked violently and his *theory* of fascism was revolutionary, but his actions were political. He sponsored the fighting, but he did not indulge in it. He immediately adopted party tactics. He ran for parliament, though he despised it. The story of how the fascist politicians finally seated themselves in the cabinet is too intricate to tell here. Suffice it to say that they cleverly shifted with the political winds, made useful alliances and finally in October 1922 used the threat of squadrist violence to force a national coalition headed by Mussolini. In 1919 the program of the Milan fascio, led by Mussolini and the futurist Marinetti, had been radical republicanism, proportional representation, abolition of the Senate, down with monarchy and church,—in short, a radically democratic

platform modelled in detail on the new German constitution. But in 1922 Mussolini found himself seated on the extreme right wing of the Chamber, bound hand and foot to the nationalists and practically pledged to the monarchy and to a *laissez faire* economics.

Unable, or at least unwilling, to take the whole government upon themselves in October 1922, these fascist politicians allowed the national bureaucracy to remain practically intact. They contented themselves with a few cabinet posts and relied on their local power and their party organization to do the work. The workings of the Fascist Party soon became notoriously bad and its ill repute grew rapidly until the Matteotti affair overwhelmed it in a wave of popular indignation.

The fiasco made by these politicians threw the control into the hands of a third group of fascisti, that is, the nationalists. The Nationalist Party, or rather since it disdained to call itself a party, the National Association was by this time composed of veteran politicians. They had begun their careers back in 1910, had urged the country into the Tripoli War and had ever since dominated the foreign policy of Italy. By allying themselves with the fascisti in 1921, they lent the movement a respectability and dignity which it had not enjoyed before. It was the nationalists who helped the fascisti into power, who came to their rescue at the Matteotti crisis and who now furnish the political backbone and brains of the government. When in March 1925, Federzoni, the nationalist leader, forced Farinacci, the typical fascist local boss and ex-socialist politician, to resign from the leadership of the Party, this event signified more than a mere personal rivalry; it meant that control had passed definitely into the hands of this third group, the nationalists. The practical consequence of the nationalist predominance in the government was the submerging of internal issues in the interests of carrying on an agressive foreign policy. Mussolini himself said, when he took power, that his task as Minister of the Interior was essentially a mere police job, and that his chief positive efforts would go into the field of foreign policy. Laissez faire internal economics and high diplomacy in foreign affairs—this is the traditional nationalist conception of government. As a result of this attitude on the part of the national government, local government was left largely in the hands of provincial fascist bosses, who in general belong to the second group mentioned above, and who

found their stronghold in the Fascist Party hierarchy. Thus, if you will permit me to make a broad generalization to which there are many exceptions, the Fascist Party has been running the internal affairs of Italy, while the government has been conducting foreign affairs. The foreign policy is boldly imperialistic and is now aimed primarily against Jugo-Slavia and France, in an effort to force these countries into extensive concessions in various parts of the Mediterranean. Meanwhile the supposedly simple police job of internal and local government proved exceedingly difficult and the fascist politicians proved exceedingly scandalous. The Matteotti crisis and still more the recent economic crisis have forced the national government to take a more serious and positive attitude toward internal affairs and toward the need of house-cleaning within the party.

The party politicians have accordingly been attacked by both the first and the third groups mentioned, that is by the squadrist fighters or the old guard on the one hand, whom Mussolini kept out of the government as much as possible and who look upon the whole political game as sour grapes, unworthy of the heroic spirit of fascism, and on the other hand, by the national government, by Mussolini and his ministry. The climax of this conflict came in the fall of 1926, when a new constitution of the Party was passed abolishing all elections within the Party and all general conventions, concentrating power in the hands of the Grand Council and packing the Grand Council with members or tools of the government. The powers of the provincial party secretaries were continually curtailed and the prefects were ordered by Mussolini to exercise absolute authority, he promising them his unqualified support. This process is technically known as "purification." Theoretically it is directed aganist the remnants of the old bureaucracy which were spared by the fascist revolution, but really it strikes a blow at the all too independent, undisciplined, autonomous and so-called "intransigent" fascist politicians. On the whole this dictatorship has been accepted loyally by the politicians, in the spirit of discipline, which is the fascist term for political necessity; but there is still a vigorous discussion in fascist circles on the question of the status of the party. On the one extreme is an influential group of the younger journalists who want fascism to be an aristocracy, that is, an autocratic government by the new elite, who,

however, must themselves be accorded the perfect freedom which genius always requires. On the other hand there is a persistent demand by the more conservative and liberalist elements both within and without fascism, that the party be abolished entirely as a political factor, and be retained merely as an educative, cultural or spiritual institution.

The spiritual side of fascism is the chief concern of the fourth group mentioned above, the idealists. Philosophical idealism in Italy has been preoccupied with combating the spiritual authority of the Catholic Church. It has tried to lend the halo of sanctity to the secular state. Benedetto Croce, to be sure, turned to art and science rather than to politics in his attempt to erect a secular home for the spirit; for to his mind the modern state is essentially an economic, not a moral or spiritual institution. But his younger colleague, Giovanni Gentile, is less exclusive and sees spirit in every and any act. Consequently, when fascism came along with its national enthusiasm and spontaneous devotion to the state, he and the great majority of the younger idealists espoused the cause and became the official champions of fascist culture.

Fascism seeks to embody not merely the Italian state, but Italian culture. It wants to have the first place in the affections and imaginations of the people. It wants to be the Church's rival on the Church's own ground. This raises a problem quite different from the old problem of church and state. It is not primarily a political problem, but a cultural one. Fascism gained its first victory over the church by surrendering to catholicism. Fascism is catholic, absolutely catholic; because the Italian nation is catholic. Whatever is national must be fascist. If it be objected that the Catholic Church is international, the fascist reply is that really it is Roman, imperial. Other nations have embraced the Roman faith when it was brought to them; but Italy has produced it. It is at home in Italy, an importation elsewhere. The spread of the Roman church is, therefore, a phase of Italy's "spiritual imperialism", a recognition on the part of other peoples of Italy's moral primacy. The church is but the organized form of Italian religion. Hence the Italian state, far from renouncing affiliation with the church, must recognize it, protect it, and incorporate it into the organic unity of the nation. The state itself must be religious, catholic.

This doctrine is two-edged. The state is spiritualized, but the church is nationalized. And here's the rub. The church is cordially accepting the one half and dogmatically rejecting the other. Fascism insists on the whole of it. Not that it tries to subordinate spiritual authority to temporal. Never! It denies the distinction. Church authority is just as ultimate in its sphere, as medical authority in its. But, since religion is only one phase of the life of the spirit, according to the idealist doctrine, and is really coordinate with science and art, it is not the independent ultimate good of life which the church claims it to be; and since the whole life of the nation must be included in the *stato etico*, it follows that religion must be included as one part or phase of that organic, spiritual unity which finds its total embodiment in the state.

But the great majority of the fascisti are quite ignorant of and indifferent to this religious philosophy. They are willing to make their peace with the church for political reasons, but they personally have no interest in giving fascism a religious flavor. Consequently, now that Gentile is no longer in the government, his successors are adopting a more superficial policy. They are catering to the church not only politically but intellectually as well. The church is reviving its institutions of higher learning and asserting its doctrines more freely. Recently it has attempted to dictate in matters of educational control, has protested against obnoxious professors, has banished text books (other than religious) from the schools, and is regaining a little influence in the universities. Gentile immediately opposed these moves and publicly rebuked the responsible, ministers for surrendering part of the authority which rightly belongs to the state. Thus it is possible, if politicians rather than educators should get control of the educational system, that the church may succeed in re-establishing its intellectual respectability, and that neo-scholasticism rather than national idealism may become the official theology of the fascist faith. But for the present this hardly seems probable. For the idealist philosophy and Gentile's reform of the schools are but phases of the more general competition between church and state to win the affections of the people.

But another phase of fascism has for the time being captivated fascist imagination and fascist politics, that is, syndicalism.[1]

[1]See my article in the Political Science Quarterly, June 1927.

Patriotic syndicalism had made its way in Italy quite independently of the fascist movement. In 1915 an I. W. W. leader named Edmundo Rossoni had founded a journal in New York called "*L' Italia Nostra*" with the motto "Not to deny, but to win our country". (*La Patria non si nega, si conquista.*) During the war he served as secretary to the Chambers of Labor in several Italian cities and was active in the *Comitato sindacale italiano.* In May 1918 this *Comitato* was transformed into the *Unione italiana del lavoro,* and Rossoni immediately became its secretary and his motto became the battle cry.

Rossoni's syndicalism was the champion of the strange combination: patriotism and revolution. Hence it found itself in opposition to both the communist international "reds", and the reformist Socialist Party entrenched in the government, to say nothing of the more conservative parties of the country. It made little progress among the industrial workers, who were dominated by the internationalistic bolshevist group, but found a foothold among rural workers and small proprietors, especially in Romagna and Tuscany, the stronghold of the revolutionary republican patriots, who were in that region the chief political enemies of the socialists. In March 1919, when Rossoni's *Unione* needed friends badly, it found a new one at Milan. Mussolini, who was then organizing his first fascio, and who also needed friends badly, suggested an alliance between fascism and syndicalism. He asked the *Unione* to declare openly against (a) bolshevism, and (b) the general strike. If it were willing to do so, he saw no reason why they might not cooperate. On the invitation of Rossoni the leaders of these various groups of national syndicalists met together on October 17, 1921, at Ferrara. A plan of union of all these groups was discussed and a national congress of syndicates called for January 24, 1922, at Bologna. In the meantime, November 1921, at the Fascist Congress, an alliance with the syndicalists was discussed and Michele Bianchi, then Secretary General of the newly made Party, was sent to Bologna Syndicalist Congress to make the offer of union. As a result of these moves the *Unione federale italiana delle corporazioni* was formed.

This in outline is the story of how fascism and syndicalism came to be united. Fascism needed labor support and syndicalism need-

ed political weapons. It was a forced marriage, and both parties had to, and still have to make large concessions and adjustments, as a result of which both are being radically transformed. For syndicalism it meant that its leaders had concluded from their tried but turbulent experience that in Italy a purely economic syndicalism is impracticable. Conflicting interests among the various leaders and among the various groups of workers, as well as between leaders and workers, kept the movement in continued disruption. And even if it were possible to unify Italian labor, its bargaining power is too weak to force capital by purely economic pressure to make perceptible concessions, since labor is the one thing which is always plentiful in Italy. The Italian worker is too near the bare maintenance level and too destitute of funds to be able to wage effective economic warfare. Only by intimidating the government could labor hope to get any power over capital. Hence, if the paradox of a really revolutionary government could be found, syndicalism might succeed. This paradox was found in fascism. Though the syndicalist leaders were at the time very loath to sacrifice their autonomy to a political alliance, they stooped to conquer. After the March on Rome, they not only were reconciled to their political partner, but became the very life and soul of the fascist bureaucracy.

For fascism, on the other hand, this marriage meant that its leanings toward a liberalistic economics and its obligations toward the bourgeoisie would have to be sacrificed eventually to a politics of government control over labor organization and thus, indirectly, to a detailed regulation of the economic life of the nation. Both parties were soon forced to approach what each had rebelled against —state socialism.

Fascism and syndicalism were much more readily identified in theory than in practice, and the March on Rome, which was supposed to be the final victory for national syndicalism as well as for fascism, really proved to be the beginning of its hardest battle. For since then it has been compelled to fight not other labor organizations but other fascisti.

The labor organizations of the other parties had slight chances of offering serious resistance to Rossoni's fascist corporations, after these had achieved the prestige of His Majesty's official syndicates.

Labor leaders of all parties began to get on the fascist bandwagon, just as other politicians did. And Rossoni immediately

gave them employment. They were sent all over the country to carry on the accustomed "syndical action." They continued to appeal to the proletariat against the exploiting bourgeoisie with all the "demagogy" that they had been accustomed to practice before their conversion to fascism. In some factories and to a greater extent in the country, they forced surplus labor on the owners, precisely as the socialist monopolies had done before. Here and there strikes were declared, supplemented on occasion by the clubs of squadrists. In Romagna and Emilia local fascist bosses like Farinacci who were favorable to the syndicates, forced employers who "exploited the new patriotic discipline of the workers for their own selfish interests" to submit to the fascist syndicates. The success of these activities was due in part to the desperate belief among laborers that their only refuge lay in these syndicates and in part to the system instituted whereby labor organizers were paid by the number of membership cards they were able to sell.

The success of the corporations split the fascist politicians into two groups: one group, which included most of the petty politicians and opportunists, objected to syndicate autonomy and wanted the fascist party to take over the syndicates and embody them into the political machinery of the bureaucracy. The other group, the right wing and liberals, resented syndicate monopoly as a revival of class antagonism and demagogy.

Originally, practically all the active syndicalists were averse to embodying the syndicalist organization into the political machinery of the fascist party. For though they were more than willing to be closely affiliated with the government and to have an official position within the fascist *movement*, they insisted on autonomy, when it came to party politics. The reasons for this were partly personal jealousy, the syndicalist hierarchy being unwilling to subordinate itself to the political hierarchy of the party, partly a well-grounded suspicion. For the majority of squadrists and the early crop of fascist politicians were quite ignorant of syndicalist affairs, and some of them were even openly hostile. But when the intimate alliance between national syndicalism and fascism became evident, and syndicalism became well established, fascist office seekers poured into the syndicalist ranks by the score, and threatened to corrupt completely an organization which was none too pure to begin with. The syndicalists were apparently flattered at first by

their sudden popularity, and opened their doors cordially. But the soon realized their mistake and an open clash arose between the party leaders and the syndicalists. The party leaders wanted only registered members of the fascist party to be admitted into the syndicates, which would have reduced the syndicate membership enormously. The syndicalists asserted that joining a fascist syndicate was tantamount to becoming a fascist and that therefore membership in the party itself was to be optional. The party leaders urged that the syndicates become administrative organs of the government; the syndicalists urged that they could operate more effectively if left autonomous.

Rossoni and his so-called "integralist" followers have tried persistently to unite capital and labor in great national "mixed" syndicalist "corporations", but they have failed. In place of this ideal, three great economic organizations have been created which form the basis for the new "Corporate State": (1) a group of employers' confederations; (2) a confederation of labor syndicates; and (3) the Ministry of Corporations. The employers' federations are the following six:

1. National Fascist Confederation of Industry.
2. National Fascist Confederation of Agriculturalists.
3. National Fascist Confederation of Merchants.
4. National Fascist Confederation of Maritime and Aerial Transportation.
5. National Fascist Confederation of Land Transportation and Inland Navigation.
6. National Fascist Confederation of Bankers.

The six corresponding labor federations have been confederated into The National Confederation of Fascist Syndicates, headed by Rossoni. To these has been added a thirteenth, the Federation of Fascist Syndicates of Intellectuals. These federations draw up "collective contracts" which govern the economic life of the nation and which are obligatory on all persons in the economic group concerned, whether members of the syndicates or not. The collective contracts are enforced by special labor tribunals, which now form an integral part of the national judicial system. This forces the people of Italy into two great hostile camps, capital and labor, effectively organized for class warfare. To pevent this last, the

Ministry of Corporations has been organized and this ministry is responsible for leading the great rival federations into the paths of peace and cooperative production.

A decree of March 17, 1927, definitely established the nature of the corporations. The presidency of each corporation is to be assigned to some citizen who has distinguished himself "in production, labor or in the direction of public offices." He is to serve without salary. In the various provinces the local functions of the Ministry of Corporations are to be assigned to some official of the prefecture or of the Ministry of National Economy. This will be done directly by the Ministry of Corporations and hence these largely nominal bodies will be not merely "organs of the state", as the theory demands, but really mere additional powers for present politicians. The corporation thus represents little more than a continual threat which the government can use against refractory confederations. At best it is a name for the implicit cooperation of the various classes in production, which, the more habitual and spontaneous it becomes, the more it automatically transforms Italy into a "corporate state". In a sense, almost anything the Minister of Corporations does may be called an act of the corporate state. For instance, every now and then he calls together the secretaries of the Party, of the Confederations of Industry, and of the Confederation of Syndicates, to examine some problem, *e. g.* industrial policy, wage policy, or the high cost of living. Such meetings really perform the function of corporations. But the corporations have more than a nominal value; their psychological value is very important. At last the ideal of Rocco, Rossoni, and the "integralists" has an official sanction and a legal basis, however much its practical embodiment may have changed.

The most significant political consequence of these developments is that the corporationist leaders have shifted their tactics and are now concentrating on demanding a corporate Parliament and economic representation. The trend in this direction became so strong that Mussolini himself announced the year 1927 as "the corporate year" and even dropped a casual reference to an economic parliament in place of the "worn-out one". Mussolini's words have a thousand echoes; and the slightest mention by him of such a possibility is enough to set the whole scheme on its feet. There was a

sudden rush of political job seekers into the syndicates. Mussolini added that the reform of representation could not be carried out all at once, but would begin "at the periphery of the state". This was generally interpreted to mean that municipal syndicalistic elections would be held first and if they proved successful, the system would be widened until finally an economic parliament would be formed. The conservative fascist papers immediately took this hint to dampen any rising suspicions that general elections were imminent. The syndicates, they said, need not expect that the present régime is ready to turn over the government to a new crowd of "electioneers".

Nevertheless, on May 26, the boldest expectation of the corporationists were justified, when Mussolini in his big address to the Chamber definitely announced that in 1929, at the end of the present Parliament, the present Chamber would be supplanted by a Corporate Chamber "elected by the corporate organizations of the state." Finally the Grand Council of the Party in November 1927 announced that the Ministry of Corporations would select the candidates for the new parliament, that its candidates would be ratified by the Grand Council, which would also make its own additions to the list of candidates and that then this approved list would be submitted to the thirteen federations for "election". The elections will presumably be conducted by the syndicates, but they are, of course, purely formal. Nevertheless, this scheme was not put forth as final. It was definitely stated that when the syndicates become more "mature", they will be given greater power. This marks at least a slight official recognition of the pressure which syndicalism is bringing to bear on the politicians in the direction of economic democracy.

The Rossoni group are urging parliamentary reform not so much as an end in itself, but as one more effort to get the corporations definitely organized. Their idea is that the new parliament should be elected by genuine Corporations. For if the syndicates elect it, the state will not be a genuinely integrated, corporate state, since parliament would divide immediately into the capital and the labor parties. The genuinely corporate parliament, on the other hand, must represent the specific "horizontal" interests and activities of the nation, not the "vertical" classes. This principle is generally accepted by all fascists. But now that the parliamentary reform

is definitely planned, Rossoni urges that the organization of genuine unified corporations is a necessary preliminary, for there must be definite organizations to carry on the election of representatives and other political functions. Thus Rossoni hopes that by means of the movement for parliamentary reform, he can gain the unified corporate organization of the nation for which he has held out consistently, but in which he has so far been frustrated.

In this he will probably be disappointed, for with the direction which the organization of the Ministry of Corporations has taken, an elaborate "integral" organization merely for election purposes is hardly possible. It is all the more improbable because at the same time Mussolini announced the new Chamber he also took the trouble to "bury universal suffrage" officially and to attack election machinery in general.

Sooner or later however the issue will have to be faced between authority from below and authority from above, between syndical organization and fascist hierarchy, between some form of democracy and some form of dictatorship.

But this issue will arise within the syndicates as well as between the syndicates and the bureaucracy. For at present it is difficult to tell whether the internal structure of the syndicates is democratic or not. In their origin and general spirit the syndicates are highly bureaucratic. The whole movement was directed from above by a few leaders who imposed their representatives on the local units.

On the other hand, according to the new constitutions in all the Confederations, employers' as well as workers', the president is elected by the Congress (or general council) of the federation, which is composed of representatives of the provincial congresses, which in turn are composed of representatives chosen by the members of the local syndicates. So that on paper, at least, the syndicates have representative government. Also the congress of the federation must approve the budgets and vote on all important issues, financial or others, which concern the federation. The president is appointed for three years (in some cases two years) and the congress must meet at least every two years. In addition the Confederation of Syndicates has a National Council, which includes representatives of the provincial federations and the executive directors, and this must meet at least once a year. At present the

Rossoni administration seems to enjoy unquestioned support and prestige, and a real test case of the workings of syndicate government remains for the future.

In any case, it is already evident that the *theory* which accompanies these constitutional reforms is not democratic. For even those fascisti who are most eager in urging a reform of representation do so not in the name of a return to democratic institutions, but in the name of carrying the fascist revolution to completion. Mussolini at the climax of his speech of May 26, 1927, boldly "announced to the world the creation of the powerful, united State of Italy .....and this state is expressed in an accentuated, organized, authoritarian democracy, in which democracy the people circulate freely." This is, of course, confused language, but the mere fact that democratic terminology is used, marks a significant change.

Economic representation must not be conceived too democratically, though it is of course more democratic than the earlier fascist doctrine. It may be that members of syndicates have the vote, but what makes the state really representative, is not this syndical suffrage but the government's capacity to interpret and coordinate the various economic interests in the nation. The fascist doctrine of representation is more like Hobbes' than Rousseau's: the ruler "represents" the people because he, so to speak, stands up for them. On the other hand, the fascist doctrine of sovereignty is more like Rousseau's than like Hobbes', for according to the fascisti it is the organized people itself, and not their government which is sovereign. Only it is not the aggregate of atomic citizens of Rousseau, but the hierarchy of associated producers that constitutes the soverign state. Or in other words, no man is a member of the state except in so far as he is part of an association which represents one of the interests of the nation. "The fascist revolution aims to transform, not to suppress the basis of popular sovereignty."[2]

In view of these developments it is impossible at present to pass a final judgment on the government of the corporate state. In any case, however, the *stato fascista* of the facist Party is being enlarged into the *stato corporativo* of the syndicates. Though the two are generally loosely identified, some fascist writers go so far as to say that fascism was merely a violent prelude and necessary means to

[2]*Critica Fascista*, February 1, 1927, p. 41.

the introduction of national syndicalism. At this, other and "purer" fascists are visibly disconcerted. Mussolini himself was willing to say to a foreign correspondent, though for foreign consumption, that fascism is a "dictatorship tending towards democracy." But whatever language is employed, the fact is clear, that the emphasis is rapidly shifting from the fasci, the militia and the party hierarchy, to the national hierarchy of syndicalist associations as the foundation of the "fascist" regime and the essence of the fascist revolution.

These remarks may indicate a few of the revolutionary changes which are under way and which are transforming the fascist state into a single national, centralized workshop. It is idle to argue whether the state has been turned over to economic interests or the interests subjected to the state. The right wing of the party insists that the corporate state is a glorified individualism; the left wing thinks it to be the triumph of the people "over the threatened capitalist insurrection." The simple fact is that the political and the economic orders are being fused into the corporate state and government is frankly becoming political economy.

HERBERT WALLACE SCHNEIDER

BIOGRAPHY AND THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

Historians and teachers of history commit sins and if a paraphrase be permitted "the sins of the historians are visited upon the children." Now what are these sins? In the first place one of the most distinguished of the guild who spent years in teaching and writing some of our best history confided to the public his belief that history was the refuge of the lazy-minded and seemed to rejoice that he had discovered the fact in time to escape to something more stimulating. And it is easy to see some of his less complicated reasons. We are so prone, we are told, to consider history as something to be once learned or mastered and retailed to generation after generation without much new light or variation, in other words when a course is once prepared to consider it no longer in need of refreshing. Also the tendency to think of history only as facts rather than as causes and effects, to dilate on the what and where rather than on the why and how. These tendencies we must confess invite lazy-mindedness. History can be and should be as vastly stimulating an intellectual field as any other—but is it always? Then, in the strenuous endeavors of its teachers to present to immature minds easy sequences, history has been simplified and attenuated to a feeble essence. Also we put our trust in phrases and catch words and instead of explaining a situation we name it. Finally we use arrangements of perverted facts under the guise of history to teach something else, we have axes to grind, ethical, patriotic, charitable, romantic. Therefore in the eyes of critics, at least, we, as teachers and students of history, are mentally not alert, we deceive, we use jargon in place of explanation, and we do not understand what history is. While any one of these strictures if dilated upon by an unfriendly critic will arouse us to speedy defense we may among ourselves admit the fact that the conditions enumerated do represent pitfalls which it is not easy for us to avoid.

In the light of this knowledge of our shortcomings what place has the study of biography in colleges and secondary schools? It may readily be seen that the subject has come to be recognized as of some importance, at least, by curriculum-makers. Three colleges, Carleton, Dartmouth and Wittenberg have established departments of biography. English departments are naturally interested in it as a branch of literature. But for our purposes it is

even more interesting to note that several courses of this type are offered by history departments, notably at Dartmouth, Washington and Wisconsin. In other words the teaching of biography has become an established fact, both in the form of independent courses and as an adjunct to regular history work. Consequently we may well consider the possibilities of making its use more widespread.

There are a number of reasons, especially in the light of the shortcomings mentioned above, why the study of biography should be encouraged, especially in high schools and colleges. In the first place we have bound ourselves down through necessity to textbook teaching. One of the results of this type of work has been that we have over-simplified in order to present logical, striking and easily remembered syntheses. We have made of history an orderly arrangement of events which corresponds in reality very little to the complex conditions of actual existence. We have conveniently divided the history of the world into more or less definite periods. We have picked out of these periods certain characteristics which to be sure are striking, but whether they were universal or not is open to question. We have taken, for instance, one of the complex institutional developments in European history, that called feudalism, we have arranged a very definite picture and put it forth as the chief social and economic institution of the Middle Ages. The question is often asked, is this delightfully orderly and, according to our story, universal arrangement a true picture of the somewhat chaotic economic and social conditions of the time? To take a later example, we have been in the habit of describing conditions in our southern states prior to the Civil War in the terms of slavery and the plantation system. To be sure there were slaves and plantations, but there was no uniformity, the great mass did not own many slaves and plantation activities differed according to the ability, enterprise and capital of the planter. In other words, do these past generalizations, standing alone, approximate that illusive quality known as truth in history? In similar fashion we place great confidence in the symbolic power of expressions. We have certain clichés or catch words which we use with all the fervor of faith which accompanied the use of the magical Abracadabras in the fairy stories. For instance we speak glibly of the Industrial Revolution, and the frontier, to use only two examples. Early in our experience, perhaps, we took care to explain to students what these

words meant. But from experience it is to be feared that many use them as if their significance were apparent to the student, so definite a picture their use brings to our own minds. Furthermore, we have developed theories of history into which we fit events. We show how certain general blind forces, such as economic determinism, environment, racial heritage have dominated the course of history and let it go at that. We consider the possibilities of striking interpretation. There have been the commercial revolution, the agricultural revolution, the industrial revolution, the American revolution, the French revolution, the revolutions of 1848, the Russian revolution, and various intellectual revolutions. Under the spell of this ponderous polysyllabic word "revolution" we forget the fact that revolution is nine-tenths evolution and that historical change instead of being cataclysmic is often times most gradual and almost imperceptible. Then there is the theory of progress, the theory that we are advancing towards some desirable and generally unknown end. On the other hand Henry Adams at least has discussed the possibility of a theory of degradation or gradual dissipation. All these attitudes towards history are by no means undesirable, in fact it may be presumed that they are necessary. After all, many believe in the wide sweep of history, in the desirability of scanning long vistas of time, but the question which the whole matter resolves itself into is, namely: is it possible to preserve an approximation of reality in our historical work?

In answer to this question it is, of course, a commonplace thing to state that history has been made and written by individuals. External and environmental forces of whatever nature have acted upon the lives of people. If we are to preserve reality in history, we cannot abandon altogether the individual. We cannot confine ourselves to broad interpretations, to the neglect of the consideration of particular cases. The activities of individuals, of course, are too numerous, even for the smallest possible conceivable period of time to make it possible, even for the most ambitious of students to consider quantitatively the reactions of those engaged in it, but my contention is that all such activities should be studied with some attention to individual cases. In other words, our courses should be worked out upon the basis of a correlation between general activities, such as the Industrial Revolution, to use the particular illustration which I have adopted and the individual reaction of

certain of those concerned; the life of one of the inventors, the activities of one of the promoters, the conditions under which some definite set of workers operated, the ways of life of some given industrial community. Now, how is this to be done?

I am not convinced of the desirability of a general introduction of courses given up exclusively to biography under the auspices of history departments. Where the conditions are right for that sort of thing, where someone is especially fitted, especially in a college or university, the experiments have worked out very successfully, but as far as the *historian* is concerned, courses of this nature have a tendency either to be too much interested in pointing out the virtues of individuals or to become diffuse and gossipy, to degenerate into a series of anecdotes about individual peculiarities, attuned to the popular taste and thus lose their quality of serious searching for reality, which if my contentions are granted, would be their chief purpose. But it is highly desirable to introduce much more biography as collateral aid to courses in history. Now for some suggestions. In the first place, we have an ever increasing amount of biographical literature. Every period in history has its biographies. Often times they are very readable, though not always so by any means. Students generally like to read biography. The human appeal and the interest in an individual as a developing personality attract; consequently, there is much that can be assigned as supplementary reading, but there should be more point to the work than simply assigning it as collateral reading and here a great deal of responsibility rests with the teacher in making apt correlation. If in discussing any given historical situation, students could be trained to bring in brief and pertinent reports as to the contributions of a given individual to the particular situation much advantage might be gained. For example, Madison's part in the Constitutional Convention, Jefferson's influence in drawing up the Declaration of Independence. There is no reason, with the variety of biography which we have, especially in American history, why high school students may not be encouraged to look at history in the light of the activities of individuals. Then there is a further possibility. In various regions of the country many near relatives of the students have participated to some extent in activities of a historical nature. Take one example. One of the principal his-

torical conditions in the United States has been the frequent change of residence of many of its inhabitants. Many have come from country to town. Many have gone from one section to another. Many have migrated from foreign countries. These activities could be described by students from data obtained at home giving details as to the reasons for and the manner of the change. Of course the results would not amount to very much from the standpoint of our general knowledge of history, but the student would be given a more personal feeling as to the process of history and the particular part played by a few of the infinite number of individuals who have taken part in the activities that have produced history. Such exercises not only are valuable from the standpoint of clarifying the student's ideas and making history more real to him, but they might lead to the preservation of some historical data. Many families have old letters, most of which are of no particular value or significance, but occasionally a garret does yield fruit to those who search. Then again the realization of the value of this material might bear fruit in other ways. Often times much material of some value is destroyed by relatives who have not sufficient interest in or knowledge of historical work to see the significance of what they are destroying. It is conceivable in rare instances at least that some student might become interested in the preservation of historical material who in later life might be in a position to save rather than burn. If we only knew the vast amount of historical material which goes up the chimney each year.

This whole question of biography places an *increased responsibility upon the teacher* or writer because the material for our biographical work is often so inadequate. If teachers do present history with a biographical emphasis or intend to, they have upon their shoulders the responsibility of a wider interest than teachers of history sometimes display. In the first place we must pass between the Scylla of hero worship and the Charybdis of condemnation. We have developed in our historical work well grounded traditions that certain men of the past were heroes and that others were villains. The historical outcast or scapegoat seems as necessary to teachers and writers of history as does the hero. We have many in American history. But after all intensive study indicates that more often the difference between the hero and the scapegoat has

been one of good fortune rather than innate virtue. Historians are not necessarily called upon to exercise their talents as judges between the sheep and the goats. But in addition to the restraint of our tendencies to praise and blame according to tradition there is the challenge which has been often sounded notably by Henry Adams in his letter to American history teachers; that challenge to a wider knowledge. It is becoming increasingly difficult to study or to understand history without some knowledge of modern biology and psychology. The every day notions of psychological process and human motivation are so out of line with the discoveries of contemporary psychological research that if we stop for a moment and measure our own standards of human conduct, our own conception of the reasons why people do things, with the latest discoveries and generalizations upon human behavior, we may well be astounded at the incongruity which we find. If every history teacher would read books like James Harvey Robinson's "Mind in the Making", J. H. Randall's "Making of the Modern Mind", Irwin Edman's "Human Traits and their Social Significance", John Storck's "Man and Civilization" and Dorsey's "Why We Behave like Human Beings", to mention but a few, not necessarily to agree with all their theories, but to at least place our own ideas and ideals of human conduct in comparison with theirs, we should have a better basis for facing that greatest intellectual problem in historical study, the intricacies, the complexities of human motivation. For after all the fundamental problem in history is why people behave as they do. It is the most puzzling problem. It is the most difficult problem. We never realize its difficulties or its complexities until we attempt to assess the reasons why certain people have done what they did. If when doing this there is not sufficient grounding in the knowledge of modern psychology the results are generally unsatisfactory, approaching upon the näive. This responsibility, of course, naturally rests upon the teachers more than upon the students. If the former can prevail upon students early to face the problem of human behavior they will have accomplished a great service for the profession. For the study of history is an evolution which can be described somewhat as follows: to the child, history is a gay picture book filled with brightly colored pictures of uniformed soldiers and decorated Indians, nobly canvassed ships, stories of heroes and battles, a subject

matter altogether delightful. Then he goes to school and to history text-books where there are names and dates and places. The gay panoply of war is torn aside and beneath it the student finds the meticulous detail: when the battle occurred, which battle preceded and which followed. He finds that the history of the United States is not entirely the history of heroes, it is the history of a series of administrations presided over by presidents, a series which must be learned in order, each of these individuals served a definite length of time, which must be differentiated from other periods of time by another series of laboriously memorized dates. When this stage has been completed the student realizes that in addition to names and dates, there are tariffs and banks and political parties with platforms, that there are elections with issues, that there are diplomatic difficulties and that there are treaties. The next stage in the evolution is a consciousness of the deeper influences behind historical development. History has become more than facts. It has the added element of forces and institutions, environment, general tendencies such as those mentioned above, movements of people. As the final step comes the realization which many never seem to gain even in the Graduate School, that history after all is the story of the activities of individual human beings. This evolution begun in early childhood is often never completed even by Doctors of Philosophy. Many times it is arrived at only after too much waste of time and effort. Now everything that can shorten this evolution, anything that can bring the final revelations earlier in the course of a student's experience will make it possible for the student or teacher to have that much longer time to exercise mature judgment, to teach more vital history and to produce significant results from research. Biography is one of the aids to this approach and besides it rescues history from formalism and mechanical synthesis and makes it a real living subject dealing with human beings, their motives and their reasons for action. In other words history without biography is like faith without works, it is dead.

ROY F. NICHOLS

One cannot remain long in Soviet Russia without having it forced upon one that the energies of the state are being directed with the utmost vigour to the securing of national economic self-sufficiency. A compromise has been made between the early Communistic programme and present circumstance. After reducing the national economy almost to anarchy, the new state has fought its constructive way through doctrinaire disagreement and civil war within, through attack and counter-attack without, and through famine and pestilence, to the quantitative production of 1913, and even beyond. The direction of the whole national economy, agricultural and industrial, is a department of the state, as are the controls of export and import trade. With the exception of agriculture, almost all production is carried out by state agencies. Again, with the exception of village barter, almost all buying and selling is in the hands of state or co-operative institutions. Prices are fixed by the state. This is possible in a land where imports from abroad are allowed not to compete with, but in moderation, to fill gaps in, the national economy, and where exports are confined to raw materials like oil, timber, and fur, or to agricultural products which can compete successfully abroad because labor is so cheap at home.

But self sufficiency entails not so much the further discovery and exploitation of the immensely rich and varied natural resources of Russia as the intense stimulation of her industries, and their extension to provide all but a few manufactured products, such as costly and intricate machinery or other complex and expensive articles for which there is at present a limited but important use. At present capital is being poured into the basic coal and steel industries to raise them from their low efficiency in order to provide more cheaply for the dependent industries, which range from munition factories to those for agricultural implements. The next objective is likely to be the reorganization of the textile industry and, granted political stability and economic success, there is to be a continuous process of economic regeneration and creation.

Meanwhile the people of Russia are paying a stiff price in privation for the success of the programme. In order that their

country may as soon as possible be in a position to ask favors from no other, and, like the United States, have the wealth to purchase such necessities as rubber in foreign markets, the Russian people are doing without luxuries and are paying rather high prices for manufactured goods of indifferent quality. Indeed, throughout the country there is a considerable famine of goods which could, but will not, be satisfied by letting down the barriers to a flood of goods from abroad. The workers strengthen their sinews with the thought that what goods there are available are more evenly distributed than under the old régime and that privation now means strength to come. The leaders appeal to a consciousness of virtue to be derived from something like present economic equality and from the belief that it is better to exploit one's self for future benefit than be exploited by a foreigner.

So it comes about that when one talks to industrial workers or to the directors of the national economy the language is like that of manufacturers and business men everywhere else in the world. Interest lies in factory routing, continuous assembly, "Americanization", even "Fordization". It all seems a little strange in a country presumably so different from the giant of modern industrial technique, the United States. What is the meaning of the talk of costs and profits and piecework and incentives and increased production in an economy which ten years ago proposed to abolish money and escape from bourgeois concepts? A thorough answer to that question would require a separate volume. A brief answer can be given without too great abuse of truth. The Communistic Elysium has been postponed to take a place in time appropriate to the actual present condition of Russia and to the steps necessary to make Russia secure and independent. Meanwhile the hope is cherished that the final coping stones of the Communistic edifice may be put in place at a later date without political danger or a loss of the social benefits which are already so highly prized.

One explanation of the change lies in the character of Russia, particularly of European Russia, which, though only 21% in area, contains 84% of the population of the whole Union. European Russia is a great featureless plain of much farmland and few cities. In it seven out of eight men are peasants and of these there are about as many as there are people in the United States.

That condition was revealed in the fact that there were two revolutions in 1917. The better advertised was one made and guided by the urban proletariat. It secured political power, destroyed the rival classes, and seized their property. It made peace, defended the truncated fatherland and set blithely about putting into instant execution the system which a more cautious Marx had indicated might be attained only after a long process of time. The period of "war communism" (1917-1921) was an attempt to telescope in time the Marxian calendar, an attempt clouded and confused by the necessity of subordinating almost all activity to the task of repelling attacks from abroad and securing unity within.

Meanwhile the second revolution had occurred, almost unnoticed abroad, and had affected something very like a permanent change, a sort of climax in the long struggle upward of the Russian peasantry. While Bolsheviks in the cities argued and frantically organized, almost mad with a mixture of new doctrine and responsibility, the peasants ejected the landlords, seized the lands, and destroyed the records of their tenurial and financial dependence. They then salvaged all the productive machinery they could, guarded it and their new-won lands most jealously, and in an inconspicuous manner hammered out as equitable a distribution of property as they could among themselves. They had plenty of worries in the attentions of Red and White and foreign armies and probably they were almost unconscious of the fact that their revolution had given them a somewhat more real mastery of Russia than the spectacular explosions in Leningrad and Moscow.

Their mastery became obvious when the government began to run short of bodily sustenance for its workers, whether in factories or offices or armies. It tried to secure peasant contributions for the mere subsistence of its experiment by the propaganda of its political and social doctrines. When that and paper money failed, it tried force. The peasants on the whole preferred the Whites, at least until the latter were seen to be landlords unchanged. The next steps were resistance to, or conversion of, the Red Army detachments which had been sent to confiscate their crops. Another obvious rejoinder was the limitation of planting to areas sufficient only for local needs. The combination of these policies was sufficient to embarass the cities and the government to the point of a change in

policy. In 1921 Lenin swung Russia back to a gold-backed money economy and from that time to this the greatest single problem of the administration, or at least the factor which has to be given major consideration in almost every decision of policy, has been the economic relation of worker and peasant.

In 1917 most foreigners were astounded by the Bolshevist proposal to make an agricultural country into a Marxian Paradise. It seemed like imposing Trade Unionism on South Sea Islanders. Time has shown that their amazement was justified. Not only have the peasants remained petty capitalists, but their mere passivity has diluted urban Marxism to Leninism. Yet it would be a very great mistake to suppose that the obvious failure and the present compromise necessarily betoken complete defeat. Perhaps they do. Time must be called upon to decide. But *at present* there is in Russia no confession of defeat, but rather a tremendous determination to force an affirmative answer to the two questions: (1) Can the peasants be made to produce more for *national* use? (2) Can they be socialized? This is the courting of Dobroi Ivan for the lawful and lasting matrimony of Worker and Peasant under the aegis of Hammer and Sickle.

Before abandoning the allegory it should be said that Ivan has a satisfying spouse in Dame Convervatism, and she has lulled him into a tradition of behaviour and usage from which only a determined and seductive rival can win him. The Russian plain is a sermon in sameness. Even its great rivers have dug themselves deep clefts in the soil and thus hidden their almost immutable courses from view. There are a few locomotives to trace a light skeleton of traffic north and south and east and west, but one feels that they might easily be blown from their right of way by any one of the solid and pauseless winds that flatten presumptuous obstacles to their unbroken sweep. There are myriads of road-spaces, but almost no real roads, and even the road-spaces sometimes disappear beneath the plough. The organization of rural society and economy is, with one exception, a living demonstration of what Western Europe practised in the middle ages. The student of medieval history can here find the manorial and village systems, little changed except that the castles and manor houses and monasteries have either been wiped off the slate or converted to social

purposes of the state. The peasants live in compact villages and go out each morning with tools and animals to work the strips in an open-field system of a simple, probably triennial rotation, on land which extends perhaps as much as ten miles until it meets the lands of surrounding villages. In spite of nomadic tendencies which still reveal themselves in the groups met travelling on holidays by cart along the roads or in the "camping" population of any railroad station, peasant life is *village* life broken only by occasional visits to towns and shrines and, very rarely, to cities. This is the economy and society which it is proposed to galvanize to consciousness of, or at least a great rôle in, the programme of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Interestingly enough, there are some striking combinations of ends and means in the dual attempt to socialize and to increase productivity, just as there are dangers that an increase in any productivity by appeal to personal acquisitiveness will tend towards individual rather than social wealth. It is obvious, for instance, that if a higher agricultural efficiency is to be secured by communal field operations by machinery, the process involves social action which can be given a socialistic rather than an individualistic container, let us say, in the form of an agricultural co-operative. In the same way, if greater crop yields with less expense for fertilization can be derived from a seven-than a three-year rotation of crops and if such a rotation needs an area nearer to that of village than of individual lands, it may be possible to socialize a village into a single buying, operative, and selling institution. Such lessons learnt locally might with dexterity become an effective analogy for a socialized nation. Some such creed, stimulated strongly by the urgent need, not only of sustenance, but of surplus for national capital increase, seems to be the actuating force behind the present governmental policy.

Aside from all other considerations, it is a gallant task to attempt the wholesale conversion and education of a hundred and twenty million peasants, particularly when the financial means are scanty. Some of the equipment is an inheritance from the old régime. Some of it, such as country houses, monasteries, and well-equipped farm establishments, has been diverted from private to public use. Much has been added to these foundations. Although

there is no Commissar for Agriculture for the whole Union and each of the six Allied Republics directs its own agricultural programme, there is for the whole of European Russia, at least, a series of comprehensive directorships which are partially coordinated by the national economic plan (Gosplan) for agriculture. The working apparatus is a combination of well known schemes with some notable local adaptations. Thus there are agricultural colleges in many centers and, while they train actual and potential farmers, their greater task is the education of agronomes, or agricultural civil servants, who go out to the countryside to live there and assist the peasants in improving their cultures. Originally of uneven quality, this small army of men is not only being steadily augmented, but its members are being graded according to their capacity, and where necessary withdrawn for further education. Similarly, there are between sixty and seventy government experimental stations (both for field and animal cultures) in the Union and not only are the products of their research conveyed to the peasants by the agronomes, by poster propaganda, and by free excursions, but a new policy of setting up miniature experimental stations *in the villages* is being vigorously prosecuted. There are now 12,000 of these in the Ukraine, and the schedule for next year is 38,000. The general system is rounded out by animal breeding stations, tree and vine nurseries, apiaries, local stud depots, and stations for the distribution of standard seed. In quality and comprehensive character the whole apparatus is admirable by any standards, in its quantitative application it is among the world's most effective organizations of a similar sort.

As in all fields of endeavor in the new Russia the principal difficulties are financial, and this becomes particularly obvious when observation is directed to such problems as the introduction of power machinery or the gradual entry upon such an experiment as a seven-year rotation of crops. The Russian response to these problems is characteristic—state credit, and co-operative institutions. Thus a village, where two-thirds of the inhabitants are willing to change their method of cultivation, may have its lands re-surveyed and re-allotted on a basis suitable for large-field mechanical cultivation and a long rotation. Its members, or the members of any village, can organize in several kinds of co-operatives, i. e., for pur-

chase of machinery, stock, seed, or general commodities, for the reception of credit or for the organization of a local credit-granting institution, or for the sale of their surplus products in the outside markets. Every encouragement possible is given to such co-operatives and their increase in the last three years has been phenomenal, although Russia is so vast that as yet the traveller in country off the railroad lines has to keep his eyes open to discover many traces of the consequent change. At the same time consistent precautions are taken to prevent the growth of class divisions among the peasants on the basis of gradation in wealth. Thus credit is free to very poor peasants and they are not taxed, whereas the richer pay handsomely (in fact, at a rate which it seems they can hardly afford) for their borrowings and are much more heavily taxed. Another example of discrimination is such a local regulation as that of a group which wishes credit for the purchase of a tractor must contain at least fifteen "poor" peasants. Agricultural news from Russia seldom gets into the foreign press, but at every annual Congress of Soviets since 1923 agricultural relief and credits have played s large a part that they have crowded their way into most of the outgoing press reports. The whole movement has recently received additional publicity from the fact that it has developed into one of the principal issues between the Stalin group and the Trotsky opposition in the Communist Party. The recent defeat of the latter presumably entails the defeat of their proposals for a "forced loan" of grain from the peasants (who are accused of hoarding) and a revision of peasant taxation designed to diminish their alleged tendencies toward re-creation of a landed bourgeoisie.

Space does not permit the mention or discussion here of the large number of conditioning and even contradictory circumstances affecting the process which has been merely outlined above. It must be sufficient to say that it is going on, is steadily increasing, and steadily improving in quality. Yet, if the peasant could be consulted, he would almost inevitably declare that his problem was not one of the production of enough food for himself and his family, or even of a saleable surplus (this averages about 20% of his crop). That he can manage and does. On an average he is himself consuming as much grain as he did before the war, but is beginning to use some wheat flour instead of confining himself to rye.

He is using about the same amount of butter, but he eats about 8% more eggs, 15% more meat, and 43% more milk. Moreover his land is now his own as long as he uses it and he no longer pays rent. It has been computed that before the revolution peasant rents amounted to two hundred million dollars annually. A. computed seven hundred million dollars of debts also disappeared with the revolution. The average annual tax rate per person was $5.06 and is now $3.96. Yet in spite of these obvious advantages and the policy of governmental assistance, the peasant faces one perpetual problem in the disparity between the prices he receives for his products and those he must pay for manufactured articles.

This difficulty has received some publicity abroad because it is a difficulty which loomed large everywhere in the years of economic readjustment after the war. Everywhere the farmer found himself at a great disadvantage as a result of a sudden change in the relation between agricultural and industrial prices, to which the nature of his occupation and financing allowed him very slowly to accommodate himself. Moreover Trotsky summarized the situation in a vivid, if somewhat inappropriate, phrase by calling it The Scissors, and some of the endless discussion and dialectic in Russia which has centered about "closing The Scissors" has found its way abroad. It has not always been realized, however, that the Russian apparatus for remedying the disparity is radically different from any other in the world. In Russia the government sets prices, and in Russia, within certain limits, the government has not hesitated to hammer down the prices of industrial goods and raise those of agricultural products. It has been engaged in this activity for the last four years and while it has not been by any means continuously successful, its performance since December, 1926, has resulted in small but quite perceptible "closing of The Scissors". The peasants' great complaint has been heard and the situation improved to the point of his being probably only slightly worse off, so far as quantity is concerned, than in 1913. The quality, however, is undoubtely worse and needs to be improved.

Two features of this situation must be mentioned, even if there is not space for detailed discussion. The first is peasant self-sufficiency. The average peasant markets only 20% of his annual produce, and spends about 60% of the return from this on textiles. It is apparent that even in a land of "goods famine" his "hunger"

for goods is narrowly confined. Consequently, even if the present industrial equipment of Russia could satisfy more than existing demands, there is plenty of scope for the awakening of the peasant to new "wants" and for consequent increase of production to satisfy them. At present his demands are much less diverse than those of the factory workers and one of the reasons for this is undoubtedly the extensive home handicraft (Kustarny) industry. This activity was deliberately discouraged in the days of War Communism and suffered also from lack of certain necessary outside supplies. As a germ of bourgeois economy it is still suspect among old orthodox Communists. Nevertheless it is now carried on in greater volume than in 1913 and there is no question but that its varied products (cloth, leather, pottery, carpentry, etc.) are a considerable element in local barter of agricultural products and that this helps to diminish the total of foodstuffs reaching the general market. It is known, for instance, that the revenue from finished products sold by certain groups of "Kustarny" co-operatives is less than the cost of raw materials bought by them. All that the government seems assured enough to do at present is to encourage co-operation in home industry. In this it has been quite successful.

The second feature referred to above is the general economic validity of price fixing, which in Russia is inevitable to some degree irrespective of production costs and can, thanks to state control of exports and imports, be nominally independent of world prices. The character of this issue can best be indicated by pointing to the outstanding conditioning circumstances. The most notable of these in relation to manufactured articles is unquestionably the success or failure in securing sufficient capital equipment and enlarging production sufficiently to make Russian industry much more efficient in production costs than it is at present. This process is of course greatly facilitated by the state-wide economic plan (Gosplan) and control of nearly all large industry. Capital can be secured, as suggested, by the sale abroad of such raw materials as oil, timber, fur, and surplus agricultural produce. It is not present policy to permit any wholesale introduction of it by foreign concessionaires, although many separate instances can be given. Some Russian industries operate at a profit and the practice is to invest this in those which do not, as well as to seize the opportunity for a

useful reduction in prices. It might be added that State direction of industry eliminates for immediate purposes the possibility that arbitrarily lowered prices will result in cessation of production.

The most notable circumstances in relation to prices for agricultural products are the low standard of living and the fertility of the "black soil" regions, which together permit so low a production cost that most of the products of Russian farm land can compete successfully in foreign markets in spite of poor agricultural technique and poor transportation. As yet the problem of agricultural surplus and its depressing effect on internal prices is not a Russian one. If Russia can be made more productive she will become more wealthy, at least until the real wages of her peasants greatly raise production costs. Moreover a comparison of present prices in Russia with those outside reveals that it is still possible to raise the peasant's remuneration by a small amount (varying with the commodities) without rendering an export trade in farm products unprofitable to the state. On the whole, however, if The Scissors are to close further, most of the movement must come from reduced prices for manufactured articles.

It is now possible to round out this general sketch by mention of one promising development now in progress, and of one difficulty which seems likely to increase in intensity. The former is the intelligent encouragement of industries which are secondary to agriculture in that they depend on it for their raw materials, or encourage diversity of farm cultures, or both. Such industries are refrigeration plants, slaughter houses, meat-packing houses, butter and cheese factories, soap and leather works, canneries, sugar refineries, flour mills, distilleries, and wineries. The Russian combination of planning nationally both the industrial and the agricultural economy has strikingly revealed their interdependence and the lesson has not been lost. In fact it might be said that much of the enthusiasm and capital which in an earlier period of the revolution were being devoted to overly ambitious schemes of electrification, are now being turned to the erection of more immediately productive institutions like bacon factories and creameries. This development is encouraging, and being encouraged by, the parallel policy of intensification and diversification of agriculture. An example can be seen in the use of maize as a year's crop in the new

long rotations. Russian peasants do not take kindly to corn meal, but Russian pigs will eat corn, and Russian cattle, corn silage. A further step which has barely begun is the operation of factories which turn this raw material into cornstarch and corn syrup.

The difficulty which shows no sign of diminution is the one which is perhaps least likely to occur to a foreigner—the overcrowded condition of rural European Russia. At present this is revealed in the small size of individual land holdings, in spite of the confiscation of the large estates and the general fairly equitable re-division. It receives additional emphasis from the high Russian birth-rate. It is, of course, most notable on the most fertile lands, as for example, the Ukraine, where the average density is 164 persons per square mile, with considerably higher concentrations in its most favorable areas. An additional consideration is that mechanization of farming means the setting free and probably the economic dislodgement of a large number of workers now actively engaged in the more primitive and more time-consuming agricultural methods. What is to happen to them? There is already a movement to the cities which may possibly have some relation to present rural overcrowding. Even granting that there be no increase in this migration, industrial unemployment is already a serious problem in Russia and the authorities concerned hold out small hopes of its early appreciable diminution. Here is another imperative reason for keeping Dobroi Ivan contented in his village. At present the scanty resources of the republics allow little more than the relief of overcrowded villages by the creation of new ones in nearby unoccupied or thinly occupied land. This is usually likely to suffer from some climatic or other handicap, but in the Ukraine, for instance, 120,000 families have been established in 3,000 new villages. It would seem, however, that something more radical is necessary, and the probability is that there must be a migration following the famous black soil as it swings around the lower end of the Ural Mountains into Asia. Empty and fertile Siberia must be colonized as the American prairies were colonized last century and somewhere the money must be found to build the necessary railways.

To sum up then, it can be said that the revolution is still going on in Russia and that, while its urban leaders state that they have abandoned any immediate prospect of a Communistic state, they

insist that they have merely postponed it, and they are endeavoring constantly to move towards its accomplishment by progressive socialization of Russia and increase of its self-sufficiency without treason to their basic principles. Clearly their greatest task is the conversion of the peasant, not only for the sake of inner harmony and solidarity in the progress to Communism, but for the sake of the sustenance of their state and the growth of its capital resources. The urban worker is enjoying a very considerable improvement of his status. The peasant can set against it on his own account his possession of his land and his greater freedom from debt and taxes. Neither can he fail to be aware of the interest taken in him by the government, however much he may chafe at the quantity and quality of manufactured goods. On the whole Dobroi Ivan is being actively courted and presumably he is slightly aware of it no matter how volubly he protests. He has a tendency to hoard grain, particularly when his village radio announces daily the imminent likelihood of a war with "perfidious Albion", and this occasionally brings him into conflict with tax-collectors and inquisitive agricultural authorities.

The total situation resolves itself into an equilibrium between the energy behind the Communist programme and that behind the natural petty capitalism of the peasants, the whole being conditioned by the fact that agriculture is the basic economy of Russia. It is a fascinating interplay of forces and it would be a bold man who would prophesy its outcome, even granting no military expenditure, either in offense or defense. Urban and governmenal self-consciousness enjoys certain obvious advantages over its peasant equivalent, and other things being equal, the worker might and does exploit those advantages. But other things are not equal. Seven men out of eight live in the villages and possess the national food supply. Stimulation of peasant economic consciousness for the purpose of increased production, means some sort of an increase in general self-consciousness. There is the recognized possibility that that self-consciousness may be made to contribute to the designs of the governors by enclosing it in collective economic enterprises, by accompanying it with increased political practice, and by bringing strong supporting influences to bear through the educational institutions. One can speculate almost infinitely on

what the future holds, and this aspect of it in Russia is of paramount interest. One can, however, probably be certain of only one thing —Dobroi Ivan is not being neglected.

N. B. For specific corroboration and statistical support of the summary statements in this paper, the reader is referred to Russia in the Second Decade (John Day, New York, 1928) which contains the reports of the technical advisors who accompanied the unofficial delegation of American Trade Unionists to Russia in the summer of 1927. Their manuscript reports have been freely drawn upon, in particular that of Professor R. G. Tugwell on agriculture. The writer's own experience was acquired from travelling 4,000 miles by rail, and 1,000-1,500 miles by motor car in European Russia, chiefly in the Ukrainian Republic. He enjoyed the fullest co-operation of the authorities, who placed no obstacle whatever in the way of his going where he wished and questioning anyone he met.

J. Bartlet Brebner

REPORT OF MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

The Council of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, at a meeting in Philadelphia in April 1927, decided to appoint a membership committee in order to stimulate interest among those not yet fortunate enough to be members. As a result of the work of this committee ninety-eight new members have joined the Association since April 1927, forty of these since the meeting in Atlantic City in November.

Of these, 36 are from New York, 19 from Pennsylvania, 29 from New Jersey, 2 from Maryland, 2 from Delaware, and 8 from District of Columbia.

At its January 1928 meeting, the Council adopted a permanent policy for the membership committee. A general chairman will be chosen by the Council to work with the President and Secretary. By these three, a chairman for each state and the District of Columbia will be appointed. These will form a more or less permanent group in order to carry out the policy of the Council. Each year, the committee members will ask certain other members in each state and district to assist in securing new members from institutions not well represented in the Association, new members from all types of institutions from the University to the elementary school, new members from all the geographical districts covered by the work of the Association, new members among the newcomers to our field. Invitations to join will be extended steadily, consistently, tactfully, with the idea of mutual benefit and interest.

The state chairmen for the current year are Mr. W. G. Kimmel, New York; Miss Anna C. Clauder, Pennsylvania; Mr. R. I. Adriance, New Jersey; Miss Mary Ott, Maryland; Miss Caroline Cooper, Delaware; and Mr. Geo. J. Jones, District of Columbia.

KATHRYNE. C. CARRIGAN,

General Chairman.

In Memoriam

LUCY MAYNARD SALMON, 1853-1927

Founder and first president of the Association
of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland.

At the age of twenty-three with the degree of A. B. from the University of Michigan Miss Salmon became principal of a high school in Iowa and served in that position five years. She then returned to Michigan for graduate study and in 1883 received the A. M. degree. In the same year Professor Charles Kendall Adams, describing the first fruits of his plan for training students in original research in history wrote: "The most conspicuous success last year was a paper on the 'History of the Appointing Power of the President.' It is well worthy of publication, and I think would be regarded as a genuine contribution to current knowledge."[1] The contribution was printed by the American Historical Association in its first volume of *Papers*, 1885-86, and Miss Salmon thus entered the guild of historians.

From 1883 to 1886 Miss Salmon taught history at the Indiana State Normal School. For a year she was a Fellow in History at Bryn Mawr College, where Associate-Professor Woodrow Wilson, author of "Congressional Government" was in charge of history and political science. In 1887 she was called to Vassar College as an associate professor to create a department of history. In 1889 she was promoted to the rank of Professor.

Miss Salmon arrived at Vassar with a complete program. It provided: for sophomores, Greek and Roman History in the first semester and Medieval History in the second semester; for Juniors, Modern History throughout the year; for Seniors, English and American History in the first semester and Political Economy in the second semester. In its recognition of the ideas of development and continuity in history, this program was in advance of the practice of the time. It was another contribution. Miss Salmon at first was the whole Department of History and gave all the courses

[1] H. B. Adams, *The Study of History in American Colleges and Univeristies*, 10.

in her program. Her method of teaching made a deep impression. A student who took the course in Greek and Roman History in 1889 wrote in 1927: "I expected to do quite well in this subject for I had 'had it' in preparatory school and I had a smug feeling that I knew something about it. I shall never forget the shock through which I lost that sense of security. The first assignment was to read either the Iliad or the Odyssey in Bryant's translation and to make for ourselves a tabulation of the political, social, and religious life of the Greeks as there depicted, with exact footnote references to the passages in the poem from which we drew our conclusions."[2] Through her forty years of service at Vassar Miss Salmon adhered to her conviction that training in the historical method of arriving at facts is an essential part of the study of history, and that history as a product must present development.

Outside of her classroom Miss Salmon was active in so many ways that a bare enumeration would fill pages. As early as 1887 she had made a study of domestic service and her book on that subject, published ten years later, is still rated as the "only important contribution to the theory of the subject." She was a member of the Committee of Seven, the only woman honored with membership in that famous committee. She planned courses in history for the elementary school and in 1902 stimulated wide discussion of the problem by an article in the *Yearbook* of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. She had plans for a book on the teaching of history. Her published writings, when brought together at the time of the Vassar Memorial Service, numbered about one hundred items. Other writings, still in manuscript, will, it is understood, be published from the proceeds of a fund presented to Miss Salmon some years ago. Her most substantial contribution—and the one upon which her fame as an historian will doubtless rest—is, of course, her work on the newspaper. The two volumes, "The Newspaper and the Historian" and "The Newspaper and Authority," contain evidence, which the most casual reader will recognize, of prodigious labor extending through many years.

---

[2]Amy Louise Reed in *Addresses at the Memorial Service for Lucy Maynard Salmon*, held at Vassar College, page 15.

In many ways Miss Salmon was useful. She had ideas of what a library should be, of what college policy should be, of how people should live together in society, of how they should act in special emergencies, including war; and in carrying out her ideas she had to the end of her life all the enthusiasm of extreme youth. By the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland she will naturally be remembered chiefly for her contributions to history and for that happy combination of a teacher who knew how to write history and an historian who knew how to teach history, which she exemplified in a degree unsurpassed by any of her contemporaries.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1926-1927

April 2, 1927

Receipts

Cash balance, May 5, 1926	$ 519.73
Dues collected during fiscal year, 1926-27	429.50
Advertisements in Proceedings	90.00
Interest in bank deposits	10.12
Sale of PROCEEDINGS	49.25
Voluntary contributions sent with dues	156.50
Total Receipts	$1,255.10

Expenditures

Expenses of speakers at meetings	$ 116.04
Expenses of secretary in attending meetings at Buffalo and New Brunswick	35.83
Office equipment	.65
Postage and stationery	99.75
Mutigraphing notices	54.45
Clerical Assistance	96.97
Publishing Proceedings	384.48
Publishing membership list	14.50
Printing programs	35.83
Balance on hand	412.52
	$1,255.10

April 2, 1927

Audited and found correct,

Witt Bowden.

Lena C. Van Bibber,

Secretary-Treasurer

REPORT OF MEMBERSHIP

November, 1927

Members enrolled in 1927		
Paid-up membership	*1927*	
Reported at April meeting	269	
Recorded members paid since April meeting	233	
New members—joined since April meeting	48	
Total paid-up membership		550
Non-paying members		3
Members in arrears		
For one year	30	
For two years	28	
Total in arrears		58
Total enrollment		611
Names dropped from roll since April meeting		
Resigned	31	
Not located	3	
Dropped from roll in accordance with constitutional provision	14	
Total dropped from roll		48

LENA C. VAN BIBBER,

Secretary-Treasurer

CONSTITUTION

Article I. *Name and Purpose*

This Association shall be known as the "Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland". Its purpose shall be two-fold: First, to advance the study and teaching of history and other social sciences through discussion and publication and, secondly, to promote personal acquaintance among teachers and students in these fields.

Article II. *Membership*

Any one interested in the study or teaching of history and *other social sciences* in the Middle States and Maryland shall be eligible to membership. Appiication for membership shall be accepted or rejected by a vote of the Council at its meeting next following the receipt of such application.

Article III. *Officers*

Section 1. There shall be a President, a Vice-President and a Secretary-Treasurer, elected by ballot at the annual spring meeting. Their duties shall be those usually attached to their respective offices. The Secretary-Treasurer shall carefully preserve records of all meetings of the Council and of all business sessions of the Association; and these and other important records and correspondence shall be kept on file in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. The general direction of the affairs of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of the three officers, the former presidents of the Association, two members elected annually and one delegate each appointed annually by such local associations as the Council may from time to time designate for this purpose.

Article IV. *Meetings*

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at the time and place designated by the Council.

Article V. *Fiscal Year and Dues*

The fiscal year shall begin with the annual business meeting. The membership fee shall be one dollar, payable annually in April for the ensuing year. Members who have not paid their dues for the current year shall not be entitled to receive the publication of the Association while in arrears, and members who are two years in arrears and have received three notices of their indebtedness shall be regarded as having forfeited their membership.

Article VI. *Amendments*

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting by a two-thirds vote of those present, notice of the proposed amendment having been given *in advance of the meeting.*

AMENDMENT

Article I. *Elective Members*

Article III, Section 2 shall be changed to read as follows:

The general directions of the affairs of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of the three officers, the former presidents of the Association, four elective members, two of whom shall be chosen annually for terms of two years, and one delegate each appointed annually by such local associations as the Council may from time to time designate for this purpose. In 1927 two elective members of the Council shall be chosen for one year and two for two years.

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES

University of California Library, Berkeley, California
Pomona College Library, Claremont, California
Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, California
University of Southern California Library, Los Angeles, California

The College Library, Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado

Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

General Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

The Chicago Public Library, Chicago, Illinois
The John Crerar Library, Chicago, Illinois
General Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Illinois

De Paur University Library, Greencastle, Indiana

Iowa State College Library, Ames, Iowa
Columbia College Library, Dubuque, Iowa
State University of Iowa Library, Iowa City, Iowa
Cornell College Library, Mount Vernon, Iowa

Kellogg Library, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas
State Agricultural College Library, Manhattan, Kansas

Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore, Maryland

Converse Memorial Library, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts
Graduate School of Education Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Smith College Library, Northampton, Massachusetts
Wellesley College Library, Wellesley 81, Massachusetts

General Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
The Public Library, Detroit, Michigan

University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota

University of Missouri Library, Columbia, Missouri
St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Missouri

State University Library, Missoula, Montana

Nebraska University Library, Lincoln, Nebraska

The Public Library, Newark, New Jersey
Rutgers College Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey

New York State Library, New York University, Albany, New York
Alfred University Library, Alfred, New York
Wells College Library, Aurora, New York
Brooklyn Public Library, Brooklyn, New York
Buffalo Public Library, Buffalo, New York
The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, New York
Hobart College Library, Geneva, New York
Colgate University Library, Hamilton, New York
Teachers College Library, Columbia University, New York
New York Public Library, New York City
Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, New York

North Carolina College for Women Library, Greensboro, North Carolina

Carnegie Library, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio
College for Women Library, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon
Oregon State Library, Salem, Oregon

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania
University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

University of Texas Library, Austin, Texas

Lawrence College Library, Appleton, Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin Library, Madison, Wisconsin

THE COUNCIL

Officers

President

HARRY C. CARMAN
Columbia University

Vice President

ALEXANDER C. FLICK
University of State of New York

Secretary- Treasurer

LENA C. VAN BIBBER
Maryland State Normal School at Towson

Additional Members of the Council

Former Presidents

C. M. Andrews, Yale University
J. H. Robinson, New School for Social Research, New York City
C. A. Herrick, Girard College
Eleanor L. Lord, Box 50, Rosenont, Pa.
H. V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania
James Sullivan, Assistant Commissioner for Secondary Education, Albany, N. Y.
Edgar Dawson, Hunter College
A. E. McKinley, Editor, Historical Outlook
Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University
J. M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University
Jessie C. Evans, Simon Gratz High School Philadelphia
M. S. Brown, New York University
L. R. Schuyler, College of the City of New York
D. C. Knowlton, Yale University
A. K. Heckle, University of Missouri
R. W. Kelsey, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
J. M. Gambrill, Teachers College, Columbia University
F. E. Moyer, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City
J. H. Latane, Johns Hopkins University
J. L. Barnard, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
W. E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania,

Elective Members

Mildred M. Coughlin, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.
Kathryn E. C. Carrigan, High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
George J. Jones, Central High School, Washington, D.C.
Rachael M. Jarrold, New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.

Delegates from Conferences

John T. Greenan, New Jersey Association of Teachers of Social Studies
Mary C. Ott, History Teachers Association of Maryland
Clarence W. Miner, New York Council for Social Studies
Anna C. Clauder, History Club of Philadelphia

LIST OF MEMBERS

Note:—The arrangement in this list is: (1) name, (2) official address, (3) residence. The city or postoffice address is given only once if it is the sam for both (2) and (3).

Adams, Charles E., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 3211 Belmont Ave.
Adams, Gladys, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
Adele, Sister Mary, Villa Maria College, Immaculata, Pa.
Adriance, Robert I., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J., 178 N. Walnut St.
Albert, Grace, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., The College Inn.
Alderfer, Clement J., Supervising Principal of Schools, Broad St., Port Allegany, Pa.
Allen, Dr. Freeman H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 44 Broad St.
Allen, Joseph Dana, Headmaster, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 200 Hicks St.
Allison, William H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 15 E. Kendrick Ave.
Ames, Herman V., Dean of Graduate School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 203 St. Mark's Square.
Ammarell, Raymond R., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 41 Llewellyn Ave., Hawthorne, N. J.
Andrew, L. Elizabeth, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.
Andrews, Ada Mary, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.
Andrews, Arthur Irving, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Andrews, Charles M., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Andrews, Elizabeth Agnes, Miss Wright's School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 307 Berkeley Road, Merion, Pa.
Andrews, Grace, James Madison High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 65 Jefferson Ave.
Arthur, L. Louise, Bryant High School, Long Island City, N. Y., 4144 Gosman Ave.

Austin, Margaret F., James Monroe High School, New York City, 2406 Frisby Ave., Bronx

Ayers, Amy M., 950 Salem Ave., Elizabeth, N. J

Bachrach, Helen, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 20 Overhill Road, Roland Park.

Bacon, Edna Lorine, East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 87 Fourth Ave.

Bader, Harriet, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Bagley, William C., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, Westport, Conn.

Baird, Mildred, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 547 Forrest Ave., Drexel Hill.

Baker-Crothers, Hayes, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Baldwin, Frances Elizabeth, Hood College, Frederick, Md., 147 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md.

Baldwin, James Fosdick, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 160 College Ave.

Bamberger, Florence Eilau, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 2206 Park Ave.

Bamberger, Stella H., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 2206 Park Ave.

Banvard, Adele F., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J., 73 N. Arlington Ave.

Barker, Corinne M., New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, Glenwood Lodge, 390 N. Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.

Barker, John B., Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 4127 Park Heights Ave.

Barnard, James Lynn, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Barnes, Harry Elmer, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., 108 Maynard Road.

Barrick, Willina, Lincoln School, Jersey City, N. J., 2540 Boulevard.

Barth, Laura Florence, Supervising Principal, Keyser-Meehan Bldg., 2020 Frankford Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Bassett, Janet, 3218 Fait Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Beard, Charles A., New Milford, Conn., 27 W. 67 St., New York City.

Beardslee, Sara E., Temple University High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4623 Newhall St., Germantown.

Beatman, Augustus S., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 527 W. 121 St.

Beaumont, Jr., Andre Alden, New York University, New York City, 37 Cleveland Lane, Princeton, N. J.

Bechtel, Mary D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Belcher, Katherine F., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 819 Grove St., Elizabeth, N. J.

Bennett, Martha Crosby, Morris High School, New York City, 178 Gaylor St., Scarsdale, N. Y.

Billingslea, Elizabeth, Towson High School, Towson, Md.,
Westminister, Md.

Billingslea, John Smith, Upper Darby High School, Drexel Hill, Pa.,
4010 Huey Ave.

Birdsall, Jean, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Black, A. M., 318 W. 57 St., New York City.

Black, Anna M., A. H. Shaw Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
1432 N. Felton St.

Blake, Julia E., Georgiancourt College, Lakewood, N. J.

Blom, E. William, East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J.,
156 Church St., Nutley, N. J.

Bolzan, Emma L., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
600 Eldridge Ave., West Collingswood, N. J.

Boring, Lydia T., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
4300 Spruce St.

Bowden, Witt, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Wallingford, Pa.

Bowman, D. H., McBurney School, New York City.

Boyce, Harriet L., Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J.

Boyt, S. Ethel, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
210 Park Ave., Swarthmore, Pa.

Bradshaw, Bessie E., Cambridge High School, Cambridge, Md.,
204 Mill St.

Brady, Mildred, 1041 Palisade Ave., Palisade, N. J.

Brandenburg, Emily Jane, 110 Augusta Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Brebner, J. B., Columbia University, New York City.

Brewer, William M., 1010 Fairmont St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Briggs, Elizabeth, Horace Mann School, New York City, The Bancroft,
509 W. 121 St.

Britten, Marion G., Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J.,
5 Albion St.

Brockway, Thomas Parmalee, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.,
250 Prince George St.

Brooks, Rebecca B., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.,
2417 N. Calvert St.

Brown, Elizabeth Virginia, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md.,
2106 N. Charles St.

Brown, J. Franklin, Editor, The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave.,
New York City, 51 Ellenton Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y.

Brown, Marshall Stewart, Dean of Faculties, New York University,
New York City, 19 Fairview St., Yonkers, N. Y.

Brown, Stella E., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Bryan, Alfred C., High School of Commerce, New York City,
416 ClermontAve., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Buchanan, Mary F., Junior No. 1 School, Trenton, N. J., 439 Bellevue Ave.

Buckle, Alice Isabel, Conshohocken High School, Conshohocken, Pa.,
134 E. Fourth Ave.

Buckley, Margaret H., 5925 Falls Road, Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md.
Bucknam, Kate D., Eastern High School, Washington, D. C.,
1207 Rhode Island Ave., N. W.
Bunnell, Theora J., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C.,
3000 Connecticut Ave.
Burch, Henry Reed, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
5208 Drexel Road.
Burlingame, Anne Elizabeth, Hunter College, New York City,
57 Morningside Drive.
Busby, Ethel, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
2035 Mt. Vernon St.
Butler, Mrs. Elva R., Preston Grammar School, Preston, Md.
Bye, Edgar C., Cumberland Valley State Normal School, Shippensburg, Pa.,
101 E. King St.
Byrom, Reba A., Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
501 Carpenter Lane, Germantown.
Cadisch, Gordon F., University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Cairnes, Laura J., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 4008 Roland Ave.
Calman, Alvin R., Upsala College, East Orange, N. J., 166 Prospect St.
Campbell, Elsie, Morristown High School, Morristown, N. J., 94 Western Ave.
Campbell, Mary B., Walton Junior High School, New York City,
2040 Seventh Ave.
Carman, Harry James, Columbia University, New York City,
21 Claremont Ave.
Carpenter, Leonora E., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.,
1317 Park Ave.
Carr, Charles F., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J.,
28 S. Walnut St.
Carrigan, Kathryn E. C., Atlantic City High School, Atlantic City, N. J.,
131 N. Richards Ave., Ventnor, N. J.
Carter, Alfred, George School, Bucks Co., Pa.
Caspari, Alice C., Junior High School No. 52, Baltimore, Md.,
Lake Ave. East of Roland Ave., Roland Park.
Castle, E. H., East Bridgewater, Mass.
Challice, C. E., Columbia Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
331 Quackenbos St., N. W.
Chandor, Valentine L., Headmistress, Miss Chandor's School for Girls,
137 E. 62 St., New York City.
Cheyney, Edward Potts, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.,
259 S. 44 St.
Cleronny, Helen E., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Clapp, Roger E. E., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.,
110 St. Paul's Road, Ardmore, Pa.
Clark, Chester Ray, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C.,
1514 Columbia Road, N. W.
Clark, Florence R., Evander Childs High School, New York City,
Bronxville, N. Y.

Clark, Marion, McKinley Manual Training School, Washington, D. C., 1657 Lamont St., N. W.

Clark, Marion G., Supervisor of Elementary Education, Montclair, N. J., 74 Montague Place.

Clark, Mary Emily, George Biddle High School, Cecilton, Md., Swan Harbor.

Clarke, May Patterson, Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.

Clauder, Anna Cornelia, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3334 N. 16 St.

Cleaver, Clarence G., College Representative, Ginn and Company, New York City, 8426-110 St., Richmond Hill.

Cockram, Edith May, Junior High School No. 4, Trenton, N. J., 36 Prospect St.

Coffin, Mrs. Elizabeth F., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 140 N. 15 St.

Coleman, Kathryn F., 37 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Conner, Frances S., Central High School, Scranton, Pa., 2440 N. Washington Ave.

Cooley, Charlotte Cecil, 325 W. 45 St., New York City.

Cooper, Caroline L., Wilmington High School, Wilmington, Del., 1314 W. Seventh St.

Corlies, James A., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Cornelia, Mother Mary, Academy of the Holy Child, 3833 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Coughlin, Mildred M., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 3823 Beech Ave.

Coulomb, Charles Augustin, District Superintendent of Schools, District No. 1, Philadelphia, Pa., 4249 Girard Ave.

Crall, F. Frank, McKeesport High School, McKeesport, Pa., 1816 Willow St.

Crim, Lula H., Supervisor of Graded Schools, Department of Education, Westminster, Md.

Cunningham, Helen, Temple University High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 2228 Spruce St.

Curtis, A. Gertrude, Walnut Hills High School, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2409 Ashland Ave.

Custer, John S., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Dales, Frances E., Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J.

Darby, Juliana P., Ridgewood High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 122 Spring Ave.

Dargo, Nathan, Seward Park High School, New York City, 742 Lafayette Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dawson, Edgar, Hunter College, New York City, 55 East 76 St.

Deane, Rev. Charles J., Dean of St. John's College, Fordham University, New York City.

Deck, Clara M., High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., West Leesport, Pa.

Denison, Isabel Noyes, Student, Columbia University, New York City, 106 Morningside Drive.

Detweiler, William G., Fitzsimons Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 41 Hillside Ave., Souderton, Pa. W

Deutsch, Arthur, Seward Park High School, New York City, 1113 Grant Ave.

DeWald, Bertha, 22 Morris St., New Brunswick, N. J.

Dewey, A. Gordon, 714 Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City.

Dexter, Elizabeth A., (Mrs. R. C.), Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

Dickinson, Florence, Bryant High School, Long Island City, N. Y., 118-19 St., Jackson Height, Long Island, N. Y.

Diehl, Mrs. Vivian B., 2737 Maryland Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Dilks, Clara Gilbert, High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6126 Jefferson St., West Philadelphia, Pa.

Donovan, Lillian, Supervisor of History and Civics, Junior High Schools, Department of Education, Madison and Lafayette Aves., Baltimore, Md., 2926 St. Paul St.

Dougherty, Philip, Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., 3 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park, Md.

Dowd, Mary A., Box 6, University Station, Syracuse, N. Y., 505 Crouse Ave.

Downey, Margaret E., 1575 Abbottston St., Baltimore, Md.

Doyle, Anne, 1227 N. Gay St., Baltimore, Md.

Doyle, John W., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 548-57 St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dragunas, William Joseph, John Jan Hall, Columbia College, Columbia University, New York City.

Duggan, Stephen P., Director, Institute of International Education, College of the City of New York, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Dunaway, Wayland F., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., 702 W. College Ave.

Dwyer, Mary M., Quinn School, Bethlehem, Pa., 528 Fiot St.

Earle, Edward Mead, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, 35 Claremont Ave.

Eaton, Margaret Clarke, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1929 Mt. Vernon St.

Eckford, Mary Wright, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 205 Aigburth Road, care of Mrs. Hobart Smock.

Eddy, Ruth M., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 35 Morris Place, Hillside, N. J.

Eddy, William Woodbridge, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 312 Cattell St.

Elder, Jane, Richmond Hill High School, Richmond Hill, New York City.

Ellery, Eloise, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Elliott, Charles H., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 330 Lincoln Ave.

Elliott, Rebecca Patton, Kensington High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 5031 Cedar Ave.

Elsbree, Oliver W., Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., 124 S. Fourth St.
Elson, Henry W., American Book Co., 100 Washington Square, New York City, 1314 Watchung Ave., Plainfield, N. J.
Ely, Elizabeth L., Headmistress, The Ely School for Girls, Greenwich, Conn.,
Emery, Maude E., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 102 Milford Ave.,
Enk, John C., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 45 N. Seventh Ave., Highland Park
Eshleman, Willis S., West New York High School, West New York, N. J., 111-33 St., Woodcliff, N. J.
Evans, Austin P., Columbia University, New York City, Montrose, N. Y.
Evans, Jsesie Campbell, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Merian Station.
Faber, Pamela Thomas, (Mrs. E. S.), Miss Beard's School, Orange, N. J., 70 Second St., South Orange, N. J.
Fairchild, J. R., American Book Company, 88 Lexington Ave., New York City.
Falvey, Anna, Richmond Hill High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 8629-106 St.
Farnsworth, Mildred A., 47 Bowne St., Flushing, N. Y.
Farnsworth, Nellie M., 405 W. 118 St., New York City.
Farrell, Letitia, 76 Shipwright St., Annapolis, Md.
Farrington, Charlotte Raynsford, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 1623 Lanier Place, N. W.
Fay, Rev. Aloysius T., Fordham University, New York City.
Fay, Harrison G., 111 W. 74 St., New York City.
Feick, Mildred C., Hampstead School, Hampstead, Md., 325 N. Calhoun St., Baltimore, Md.
Ferry, Nellie P., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 4510 Chestnut St.
Fleming, Carrie O., Julia Richman High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 450 E. 26 St.
Flick, Alexander Clarence, State Historian, University of the State of New York, State Bldg., Albany, N. Y.
Fontaine, E. Clarke, State Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md., 114 Water St., Chestertown, Md.
Ford, Grace Pascal, Elmer Ellsworth Junior High School, New York City, 527 W. 121 St.
Foresman, Edwin Clyde, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Fortenbaugh, Robert Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., 235 W. Lincoln Ave
Fox, Dixon Ryan, Columbia University, New York City, Hartsdale, N. Y.
Fox, Ida M., Guilford School, Baltimore, Md., 2222 N. Calvert St.
Freburger, Mary L., 539 N. Carrollton Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Freeman, Sara H., Englewood High School, Englewood, N. J., 287 Tenafly Road.
Frick, Mary G., (Mrs. W. H.), St. Agatha School, 559 West End Ave., New York City, 108 Overlook Ave., Great Neck, N. Y.
Friedenthal, Mrs. Rose L., High School of Commerce, New York City, 107 W. 74 St.

Furlong, Philip J., Cathedral College, New YorkCity, 462 Madison Ave.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 548 Riverside Drive.
Gardner, Elizabeth, Laurel High School, Laurel, Md., 316 Montgomery St.
Gaskill, Lois L., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1205 Avenue G.
Gemmill, Charlotte E., Conshohocken High School, Conshohocken, Pa., 310 Fayette St.
Gerboth, H. B., Harcourt, Brace and Company, 383 Madison Ave., New York City.
Gibbons, Alice Newman, East High School, Rochester, N. Y., 1592 Highland Ave.
Gibson, Achsah Elizabeth, Edgar Allan Poe School, Baltimore, Md., 3631 Elm Ave.
Gibson, Mary E., Adare School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1104 E. Montgomery Ave.
Gilbert, Amy M., Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y., 298 N. Main St., Chambersburg, Pa.
Giltner, Emmett E., New York Training School for Teachers, 135 St. and St. Nicholas Terrace, New York City, 85 Grant St., Yonkers, N. Y.
Gipson, Lawrence H., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., 231 E. Market St.
Glass, Lillian Simpson, Shaw Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 815 S. St. Bernard St.
Glocker, Mrs. Lelia F., 2909 W. Presstman St., Baltimore, Md.
Golder, A., Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 3508 Fairview Ave.
Goldstone, Edwin G., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Goodman, Hannah, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1306 S. 53 St.
Goshaw, Mildred, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 428 Conarroe St., Roxboro.
Gottschalk, Joseph M., Frankfort High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5032 Cedar Ave.
Gowen, Edith, Roosevelt Junior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 16 High St.
Grady, Mrs. Eleanor Hunsdon, Hunter College, New York City, 550 W. 140 St.
Gregg, G. F., Western High School, Washington, D. C., 1342 Quincy St., N. W
Green, Joseph C., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 176 The Western Way.
Greenan, John T., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J., 312 N. Walnut St.
Greene, Evarts Bontell, Kent Hall, Columbia University, New York Ciy, 35 Claremont Ave.
Greene, Garton S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Greer, Roxy R., Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y., 106 W. 13 St., New York City.
Gross, Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City.

Haasz, George Neiler, South Philadelphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 1733 N. 25 St.

Hale, Harriet F., Morris High School, New York City,

Halloway, Virginia C., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 310 Strathmore Ave., Hamilton.
1141 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hamilton, A. Grace, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 18 N. Rigby Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.

Hamilton, Ruth Gertrude, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 39 Auburn St., Brookline, Mass.

Hanaway, Roy Clark, 21 Crescent Ave., St. George, Staten Island, N. Y.

Hanson, Daisy Evelyn, New York Training School for Teachers, 135 St. and St. Nicholas Terrace, New York City, 221 Egmont Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Harbold, Grace Ellen, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1820 Columbia Ave.

Harden, Mary, State Normal School, New Haven, Conn.

Harrison, Minnie B., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6033 Pine St.

Haslup, Alice E., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 121 Thirteenth St., N. E.

Hatch, Roy Winthrop, Teachers College, Columbia University and Horace Mann School, New York City, 323 Beechwood Place, Leonia, N. J.

Hayes, Carlton J. H., Columbia University, New York City, 35 Claremont Ave., Afton, N. Y. (from June 1 to Oct. 1)

Hawyard, Clara Violet, Caldwell Junior High School, Upper Montclair, N. J., 11 Garfield Place.

Hazen, Charles Downer, Columbia University, New York City, 42 E. 75 St.

Heald, Mark Mortimer, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 185 N. Moore St., Princeton, N. J.

Heckel, Albert Kerr, Dean of Men, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., 7 Glenwood Ave.

Hedden, Elma W., State Normal School, Newark, N. J., Mt. Pleasant Ave., West Orange, N. J.

Hedge, Louise June, 1453 Glenwood Road, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hendley, Charles James, George Washington High School, New York City, W. 232 St. and Fairfield Ave.

Herrick, Cheesman Abiah, President, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hester, Mrs. Laura Pywell, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Glencarlyn, Va.

Hill, Huntington, New York University, University Heights, New York City, Huntington, N. Y.

Hiss, Mary C., Bel Air High School, Bel Air, Md.

Hoban, Florence A., Fitzsimons Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Southampton, Pa.

Hoblitzell, M. Nettie, Federal Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1519 Park Ave.

Hock, Emma B., Moravian Seminary and College for Women, Bethlehem, Pa.

Hodgdon, Frederick Crosby, Member of firm of Ginn and Company, Educational Publishers, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, 4 Gramercy Park.

Hodgdon, Mrs. F. C., 4 Gramercy Park, New York City.

Hodgkins, George Wilson, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 1921 Kalorama Road.

Hoffert, Valeria E., Girls High School, Reading, Pa., R. D. No. 1, Sinking Springs, Pa.

Hollenbach, Charles R., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Holt, Lucius Hudson, Colonel, United States Army, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Hood, Raymond, Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Horowitz, Max, Managing Director, Moeller Boarding School, Yonkers, N. Y., 87 Alta Ave.

Howard, Elizabeth I., 86-05 Britton Ave., Elmhurst, N. Y.

Howe, Samuel Barnett, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 33 Lehigh Ave.

Hubbard, John T., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J., 296 N. Walnut St.

Hughes, Ray Osgood, Peabody High School, Pittsburg, Pa., 5517 Beverly Place.

Hughes, Sara M., Vice Principal, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 7 Grandview Place.

Hull, Charles Henry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 413 E. Buffalo St.

Hull, William Isaac, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Hussong, Hazel, Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 603 Pearl St., Camden, N. J.

Huttman, Maude A., Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City., 308 W. 73 St.

Hyatt, Alton Rufus, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Isanogle, Alvey Michael, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.

Jacobs, Ethel L., 120 Linden Ave., Bloomfield, N. Y.

Jameson, Samuel H., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Jarrold, Rachel M., State Normal School, Trenton, N. J., 516 E. State St.

Jenkins, Alice E., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 1513 Lafayette St.

Jett, Saville Clift, 2105 St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.

Johnson, Henry, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Johnson, Lloyd Wellington, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y., 75 Nassau Ave. Malverne, N. Y.

Johnston, Warren G., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 6917 Cottage St., Tacony.

Jones, George J., Head Department of History, High Schools of Washington, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 3670 Park Place, N. W.

Jones, M. Elizabeth, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 257 S. 16 St.

Josepha, Sister M., Principal, Holy Trinity School, 3513 N St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Jurkat, Frank Albert, Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio.

Kahn, Fannie, Gwynn's Falls Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., Marlborough Apartments.

Kaplan, William, 1649 N. Seventh St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Kauffman, Rose M., Kensington High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 4246 Pine St.

Kause, Selma, Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1224 Monroe St., N. E.

Kaye, P. Lewis, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 102 Pinkney Road.

Kayser, Elmer Louis, Director of Summer School, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 2031 F. St.

Keffer, Mrs. Mary V., Westmont Upper-Yoder High School, Johnstown, Pa., 520 Franklin St.

Kelly, Frank B., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

Kelsey, Raynor W., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Kennedy, Edna R., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 57 Gardner Ave.

Kern, Nelson Eugene, Allentown High School, Allentown, Pa., 1104 S. Seventh St.

Kerpen, Otto, James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 857 N. Crotona Park.

King, Mrs. Florence B., William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 3622 Hamilton St.

Kinnear, Agnes I., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C.

Kirk, Byron, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., Roseland, N. J.

Kirkman, Loulie Redus, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 257 W. Eleventh St.

Klinesmith, Bessie, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2913 Hawthorne Ave.

Knapp, Charles Merriam, Western Michigan State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Mich., 533 W. Vine St.

Knee, Pauline, Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 401 Cathcart Road, Clarendon, Va.

Kneeland, Edwin Leroy, Ridgewood High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 33 Park Place.

Knowlton, Daniel C., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Knox, Antoinette, Poughkeepsie High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 13 Randolph Ave.

Koch, Flora M., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 309 W. 109 St., New York City.

Kochka, Mary M., (Mrs. J. L.), Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 3701 Massachusetts Ave.

Kollock, Margaret R., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1926 Spring Garden St.

Kreutzenauer, Sarah, 1421 Madison Ave., New York City.
Krout, John A., Columbia University, New York City, 141 Nagle Ave.
Kull, Irving Stoddard, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 203 Lincoln Ave.
LaFollette, Robert, Ball Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.
Lamm, Lucian, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, 2757 Claflin Ave., Bronx, N. Y.
Lamson, Elizabeth H., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1715 Kilbourne Place, N. W.
Lane, Layle, James Monroe High School, Bronx, N. Y., 127 W. 141 St., New York City.
Landsdowne, James D., Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 103 E. Essex Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Langford, A. M., Heightstown, N. J.
Langsam, Walter Consuelo, Columbia University, New York City, 63 W. 87 St.
Latane, Edith, St. Margaret's School, Tappahannock, Va.
Latane, John H., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 210 Chancery Road.
Lavers, Lida A., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 42 Kearny St.
Lawrence, Antoinette, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., 25 McDonough St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lawson, Leonard Axel, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 344 Piltney St.
Leary, Marion Beall, 80 Center St., Oakland, Md.
Lee, Linette E., Senior High School, Brunswick, N. J., 153 College Ave.
Lee, Mary Webb, Street, R. D., Harford County, Md.
Leete, Gertrude, Richmond Hill High School, Richmond Hill, New York City 9344 Hollis Court Blvd., Queens, N. Y.
Leffler, Katherine, New York Training School for Teachers, 135 St. and St. Nicholar Terrace, New York City, 36 W. 93 St.
Lentz, E. Marie, Dean of Girls Senior High School, Altoona, Pa., 422 Willow Ave.
Leonard, Caroline W., Bayonne High School, Bayonne, N. J., 100 W. 33 St.
Lettinger, Leonard A., Supervising Principal, Willow Grove, Pa.
Levinson, Florence, Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 4025 Reisterstown Road.
Levy, Clara, State Normal School, Newark, N. J., 230 N. Sixth St.
Lewis, Ernest Dorman, Evander Childs High School, New York City, 120 E. 184 St.
Lewis, William Dodge, Editor-in-chief, The John C. Winston Company, 1010 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa., Lansdowne, Pa.
Lincoln, Anna T., Willard Hall School, Wilmington, Del., 721 Adams St.
Lindley, Charles A., College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lingelbach, William E., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Littell, Anna L., Junior High School, Scotch Plains, N. J., Lock Box 144.

Lokke, C. L., Furnald Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Lord, Eleanor L., Box 50, Rosemont, Pa.
Lucey, Anna M., Evander Childs High School, New York City, 2538 Creston Ave.
Lunt, W. E., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Lynch, Jr., John H., 5845 Catherine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mace, William Harrison, 1205 Harrison St., Syracuse, N. Y.
MacLear, Anne Bush, Hunter College, New York City, 118 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Magoffin, Ralph Van Deman, New York University, New York City, 2081 Wiegard Place.
Manning, Frederick J., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Roberts Road, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Mansion, Frances A., 120-82 St., Jackson Heights, N. Y.
Marsh, Genevieve, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., The Ontario, 215.
Martin, Anna Kendall, 650 W. 170 St., New York City.
Marty, Sara M., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 45 Edgewood Ave.
Masland, Marion Woodworth, High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1520 N. Fifteenth St.
Masterson, Rev. Peter V., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Matthews, Jr., William H., Columbia University, New York City, 600 W. 116 St.
McCarty, Cora Business High School, Washington, D. C., 106 Hammond Court, Thirtieth and Q St., N. W.
McClain, Miriam, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
McClellan, Effie G., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 212 Pittston Ave.
McClintock, Anna S., 229 N. Linwood Ave., Baltimore, Md.
McClosky, Mary Lee, Chattle High School, Long Branch, N. J., 129 Norwood Ave.
McCreary, Gerturde R., Liberty High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 728 N. High St.
McCulloch, Margaret C., Penn School, Frogmore P. O., St. Helena Island, S. C., 446 S. Centre St., Orange, N. J.
McGoldrick, Joseph D., Columbia University, New York City, 596 Madison St.
McGraw, E. Leona, Morris High School, New York City, 452 W. 149 St.
McGroarity, Mary Evangeline, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Falls Church, Va.
McKee, Jr., Samuel, Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City, 211 Fort Washington Ave.
McKenzie, Isabel, Hunter College, New York City, 50 Curtis Place, Maplewood, N. J.
McKinley, Albert Edward, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 6901 Germantown Ave.
McMaster, Mrs. Virginia N., Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.

McMaster, William Edwin, Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.
McMurry, Donald LeCrone, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 203 Cattell St.
McNally, Lucille H., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
McQueen, Alice Edgerton, High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6316 Sherman St., Germantown, Pa.,
McQuilland, George T., Morris High School, New York City, 8501-94 St., Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y.
Mead, Nelson P., College of the City of New York, New York City, 81 Hillside Ave., Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Melchoir, D. Montford, Supervisor of High School Instruction, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Meng, Mabel Anna, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3767 N. Gratz St.
Merrill, George Abbot, Hackensack High School, Hackensack, N. J., 73 Johnson Ave.
Michener, Albert Oswald, Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 2131 W. Venango St.
Miller, Helen, Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.
Miller, Margaret I., State Normal School, Trenton, N. J., 50 Atterbury Ave.
Miller, Ralph W., Highland Park School, Upper Darby, Pa., 238 Ardmore Ave.
Miller, Sarah D. L., Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 4906 Knox St.
Miner, Clarence E. W., Theodore Roosevelt High School, New York City, 921 St. Nicholas Ave.
Miner, Dwight Carroll, Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City, 3 Caryl Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Mitchell, Lucile, Oakland, Md.
Mitchell, Pearl Boring, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 5016 Locust St.
Mohair, Anna B., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 10 Summit St., East Orange, N. J.
Mohr, Walter Harrison, George School, Bucks County, Pa.
Monroe, Elsie M., Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 154 W. Sharpnack St.
Moon, Parker Thomas, Columbia University, New York City, 29 Claremont Ave.
Moore, Emily E., North East, Md.
Moore, Olive, Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Md., 66 Frost Ave.
Morehouse, Frances, Hunter College, New York City, 414 W. 121 St.
Morley, Mrs. Caroline C., Shaw Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1315 S. 53 St.
Morrissy, Elizabeth, Notre Dame College, Baltimore, Md., 3107 St. Paul St. Summer address, 228 N. Taylor Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Morse, Livingston Burrill, College of the City of New York, New York City, 400 W. 160 St.

Moyer, Fayette E., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, 87 Grove St., Montclair, N. J.

Mudd, H. L., High School, Bayonne, N. J., 107 W. Eleventh St., New York City.

Mueller, Henry R., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 230 N. Twentieth St.

Munro, Dana Carleton, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Murphy, Joseph M., Hunter College, New York City, 2940 Broadway.

Murray, Effingham C., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, 50 Barrow St.

Murray, Lucy E., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 1930 Mt. Royal Terrace.

Murray, Robert Cornelius, Riverdale Country School, Riverdale-on-Hudson, N. Y., 2623 Sedgwick Ave., Kingsbridge, New York City.

Musser, John, Graduate School, New York University, New York City, 2312 Loring Place.

Muthard, William, Coatesville High School, Coatesville, Pa., 600 E. Lincoln Highway.

Muzzey, David S., Columbia University, New York City, 492 Van Cortlandt Park Ave.

Nelson, Mabel F., North Shore Hotel, Evanston, Ill.

Nettleton, Harriet A., Madison School, Newark, N. J., 842 S. Fourteenth St.

Newcomb, Mary A., 144 Twelfth St., N. E., Washington, D. C.

Nichols, Roy F., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 108 S. 36 St.

Norman, Mrs. Julia T., Columbia University, New York City, 148 Morningside Road, Yonkers, N. Y.

North, Lila V., Montclair High School, Montclair, N. J., 178 Summit Ave., Upper Montclair, N. J.

North, Mary, Montclair High School, Montclair, N. J., 4 Norman Road, Upper Montclair, N. J.

North, Samuel M., State Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md., The Greenway Apts.

Northrop, Amanda Carolyn, Hunter College, New York City, 131 E. Thirtieth St.

Norwood, J. Nelson, Dean, Alfred College, Alfred, N. Y.

Nulle, S. H., College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

O'Brien, Mayme, Junior High School, Franklin, Pa., 412 Tenth St.

Oliver, John W., University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Pa., University Club.

Osgood, Ellen L., Coordinator, Julia Richman High School, New York City; Women's University Club, 106 E. 52 St.

Ott, Mary Castle, Hood College, Frederick, Md.

Outcalt, Ethel Louise, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, 40 South Warwick Apt.

Packard, Frederick L., Montclair High School, Montclair, N. J., 34 Oakwood Ave., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Paine, Frederick Holmes, Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 185 Gates Ave.

Palmer, Earle Schuyler, Montclair High School, Montclair, N. J., 38 Godfrey Road.

Palmer, Rilla Wood, East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 79 Milford Ave.

Park, Joseph H., New York University, University Heights, New York City.

Park, Julian, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Niagara Square.

Patch, Ralph S., High School, Plainfield, N. J., 829 Osborn Ave.

Patton, Mary P., 412 W. 114 St., New York City.

Peardon, Thomas Preston, Furnald Hall, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.

Peck, Beatrice, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 4922 Chancellor St.

Peckham, Beulah A., West Orange High School, West Orange, N. J.

Penniman, Ralph Wentworth, Masten Park High School, Buffalo, N. Y., 29 Knowlton Ave., Kenmore.

Pfatteicher, Dorothea M., Fitzsimons Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1121 S. 51 St.

Phillips, Gladys E., Hampstead High School, Hampstead, Md., 417 Maryland Ave., Cambridge, Md.

Phillips, Jesse C., Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 718 S. 55 St.

Phinney, Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Associate Principal, The Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y.

Phipps, William, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., Box 20, Wardour, Annapolis, Md.

Pickett, Isabelle, Western High School, Washington, D. C., 2823-38 St., N. W.

Pielert, Mrs. Mabel A., Middle River, Baltimore County, Md.

Pippin, Mrs. Elizabeth E., Caroline High School, Denton, Md.

Pitt, Miss H. Francis, Ripley, N. Y.

Pitt, Ruth E., East High School, Buffalo, N. Y., 126 Pidwell Parkway.

Plate, Emma, Bayonne High School, Bayonne, N. J., 344 Highwood Ave., Leonia, N. J.

Pratt, Julius W., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., 433 Parkside Ave.

Prentice, Leigh W., Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 5006 N. Erringer Place.

Price, Blanche D., Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 404 W. School Lane.

Price, Joseph Haines, Germantown Friends School, Germantown, Philadelphia, 7435 Sprague St.

Priest, W. Edwin, Western High School, Washington, D.C.

Puig, Louise M., Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1270 Carroll St.

Quinlan, Grace M., Maxwell Training School for Teachers, Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Race, Marian N., Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J., 272 Lafayette Ave.

Ranck, James B., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.
Raubenheimer, Otto, 1341 Fulton Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Raymond, Irving W., Columbia College, Columbia University, New York City, 404 W. 115 St.
Redmond, M. Lucy, 20 Madison St., Annapolis, Md.
Reese, Lillian Berry, Lafayette Junior High School, No. 79, Baltimore, Md., 4103 Roland Ave.
Renninger, George Hanson, 317 E. Oakdale Ave., Glenside, Pa.
Renninger, Warren D., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rexford, Frank A., Supervisor of Civics, 445 Third St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rice, Roland, Pizarro, Va.
Rice, Winfield L., Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 769 St. Marks Ave.
Richardson, Mary Woods, South Side High School, Memphis, Tenn., 1259 Harbut Ave.
Ridgeway, George Loveland, Riverdale Country School, Riverdale-on-Hudson, New York City.
Rigney, Sister Regina, Mercedes College, Mt. St. Vincent-on-Hudson, New York City.
Risley, A. W., New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y., 455 State St.
Roberts, William Ely, West Philaddlphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 207 McKinley Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Robinette, Rosalie A., Central High School, Washington, D. C., Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Robinson, George B., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., Livingston Apts.
Robinson, James H., 924 West End Ave., New York City.
Rogers, Elizabeth Frances, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
Rooney, Hugh C., James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 550 W. 157 St.
Roorbach, Agnew O., William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 1815 Whitehall St.
Roys, Marion I., East Side High School, Newark, N. J.
Rugg, Harold, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 425 W. 123 St.
Rust, Louise B., 252 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
Ryan, Edward A., Loyola College, Evergreen, Baltimore, Md.
Ryan, Rev. Thomas F., Dean, St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y., 75 Lewis Ave.
Ryden, George Herbert, University of Delaware, Newark, Del.
Sachs, Julius, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 225 W. 86 St.
Saurwalt, Alma Virginia, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 5415 N. Eleventh St.
Sayre, J. Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City, 3 Hawthorne Place.
Scarborough, Nellie, 2101 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.

Schapiro, J. Salwyn, College of the City of New York, New York City, 184 Second Ave.

Schmidt, Martha Virginia, High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., 1022 N. Fourth St.

Schulting, Emily, 332 Gregory Ave., Passaic, N. J.

Schuyler, Livingston R., College of the City of New York, New York City, 520 W. 114 St.

Schuyler, Mary Eloise, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4922 Chancellor St.

Schwab, William K., Atlantic City High School, Atlantic City, N. J., 21 N. Haverford Ave.

Schweppe, Emma, 533 W. 124 St., New York City.

Scott, Helen A., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Scott, Pauline, Business High School, Washington, D. C., 2000 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Sebring, Emma G., Principal, St. Agatha's School, New York City, 553-559 West End Ave.

Selecter, Rachel, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Selmser, Gail H., Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4816 Windsor Ave.

Semmes, Raphael, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Shafer, Mary Catherine, East Stroudsburg State Normal School, East Stroudsburg, Pa., 111 N. Seventh St., Stroudsburg, Pa.

Shafer, May L., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., The Arlington Hotel.

Shattuck, Blanche E., Ogontz School, Ogontz School Post Office, Pa.

Shaughnessy, Margaret, 1433 Bolton St., Baltimore, Md.

Shearer, Augustus H., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.

Shefloe, Joseph S., The Macmillan Company, 64-66 Fifth Ave., New York City. 2314 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.

Sheldon, Laura C., Riverdale, Conn.

Shepherd, William R., Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York City.

Shiels, Albert, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 515 W. 120 St.

Shipman, Henry Robinson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 27 Mercer St.

Shotwell, James Thomson, Director of Division of Economics and History, Columbia University, New York City, 257 W. 86 St.

Shower, Cecilia M., Manchester, Md.

Shryock, Richard Harrison, Duke University, Durham, N. C., Beverly Apt. No. 14, Main and Watts Sts.

Shumaker, Joseph McD., Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pa., 1402 Chew St.

Sigman, James G., Principal, Gillespie Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3300 N. Bonvier St.

Simpson, I. Jewell, Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md., Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave.

Simpson, Sarah A., 430 W. 118 St., New York City.
Singleton, Elizabeth, 17 E. 62 St., New York City.
Sioussat, St. George L., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Skinner, Avery W., Director of Examinations and Inspections Division, New York State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y., 180 Washington Ave.
Skinner, Mabel, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 175 W. 73 St.
Smith, Donald E., George Washington High School, New York City, 3385 Sedgwick Ave.
Smith, Edward P., Supervisor of Social Studies, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Smith, Jennie R., Elmira Heights, N. Y.
Smith, Margaret Virginia, Coxsackie High School, Coxsackie, N. Y., 113 Duer St., Plainfield, N. J.
Smith, Sherman M., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 25 E. Plesant St.
Smith, William Roy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 140 Radnor Road.
Snowden, Sarah W., Newburgh High School, Newburgh, N. Y., 238 Montgomery St.
Spence, Lydia E., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 626 S. Paca St.
Spencer, Abraham Lincoln, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Aldine Hotel.
Staples, Blanche L., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 2953 Hudson Blvd.
Stauffer, Robert G., 139 Main St., Emaus, Pa.
Steele, Esther Clarkson Mayer, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Steichen, Elizabeth, New Brunswick High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 233 Baldwin.
Steinberg, Samuel, De Witt Clinton High School, New York City.
Stellwagon, George Heist, South Philadelphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 656 N. 33 St.
Stern, Bessie, State Department of Education, 2014 Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
Stern, Anna Louise, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., Sewell, N. J.
Stevenson, Helen G., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 279 Mt. Prospect Ave.
Stewart, Mary, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 624 Maryland Ave., N. E.
Stewart, Mary Weldon, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1218 S. Broad St.
Stewart, Sadie B., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.
Stoloff, Mrs. Rose C., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Stolzenberg, Bessie, Seward Park High School, New York City.
Stough, Mulford, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 210 South West St.
Strauss, Percival S., Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 6012 Morton St.
Strayer, Minnie H., 400 N. Carey St., Baltimore, Md.

Streeper, Amanda, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia Pa., 632 N. Fortieth St.
Stryker, C.W., St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 98 College Ave.
Stryker, Florence E., State Normal School, Montclair, N. J., 10 Roosevelt Place.
Stube, Charles Frederic, Calumbia High School, South Orange, N. J., 66 Watson Ave., East Orange, N. J.
Stutz, Rose C., Western High School, Washington, D. C., 1628 Swann St., N. W.
Sullivan, James, Assistant Commissioner for Secondary Education, University of State of New York, State Education Bldg., Albany, N. Y.
Sutch, Cleora, Scarsdale High School, Scarsdale, N. Y., Maple Lawn.
Suter, Carl William, Leonia High School, Leonia, N. J., 186 Crescent Ave.
Swain, James Edgar, Muhlenburg College, Allentown, Pa., 82 E. Stewart Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Sweet, Alfred H., Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
Swetland, Roger Williams, Headmaster, Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.
Swinghammer, Antoinette C., Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Netherland Apt.
Talcott, Mabel Hall, Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Conn., 454 Washington St., Hartford, Conn.
Tall, Lida Lee, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
Tanner, Edwin P., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., 210 Walnut Place.
Taylor, Hazel, Germantown High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 68 Harvey St.
Taylor, Jane I., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 5 W. 124 St.
Teakle, Thomas, Lewis and Clark High School, Spokane, Wash., 1509 Ninth Ave.
Temansen, Daniel, Julia Richman High School, New York City, 950 Montgomery St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Textor, Lucy E., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomas, Bernadotte, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., 77 W. Stratford Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Thompson, Eleanor, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 2020 N. 21 St.
Thompson, James Arthur, Singerly School, Philadelphia, Pa., 669 Brooklyn St.
Thompson, Mrs. M. Berna Hunt, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 445 Bergen Ave.
Tibbitts, C. H., High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 7 Grubb St.
Tieman, Elsie C., 128 W. Eleventh St., New York City.
Timmons, Anna D., Roosevelt Junior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 15 Hardenbergh St.
Toner, Caroline E., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1814 Ingleside Terrace, N. W.

Townsend, Caroline May, Towson High School, Towson, Md., 3312 Westerwald Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Townsend, Mary Evelyn, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 300 W. 109 St.

Trimble, Helen B., State Normal School, East Stroudsburg, Pa.

Tucker, Bethania, Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J., 5 Albion St.

Tussey, Moore C., College Department, Henry Holt and Company, 1 Park Ave. New York City, 19 W. 44 St.

Twaddell, Helen, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3620 Hamilton St.

Valentine, Katherine, Hampstead Hill Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1120 N. Calvert St.

Van Bibber, Lena Chew, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 129 E. North Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Van Dyke, Paul, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Van Keuren, Edwin, Hellerton High School, Hellertown, Pa., 712 Maple St., Bethlehem, Pa.

Van Sant, Sarah, 3009 Clifton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Van Vleck, George W., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Varley, Elsie D., Ossining School for Girls, Ossining, N. Y.

Vincent, John Martin, Professor Emeritus, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 313 Forest Road, Roland Park.

Vliet, Andrew M., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C.

Wagner, Hardesty Emory, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 46 Park Place, Audubon, N. J.

Waidlich, Luther F., Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 360 N. Main St., Sellersville, Pa.

Waldo, Virginia, Miss Hockaday's School, Dallas, Texas.

Walker, Margaret Merrifield, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4750 Penn St.

Walter, Ella C., Johnstown High School, Johnstown, Pa., 520 Franklin St.

Walters, Raymond, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., 6 Whittier Place.

Walther, E. Curt, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 715 Evesham Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Walton, George A., Principal, George School, Bucks County, Pa.

Wanger, Ruth, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., [redacted] 833 W. Marshall St., Norristown, Pa.

Ware, Caroline F., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Warren, Mrs. Florence L., 412 E. Fourth St., Wilmington, Del.

Waters, Suzanne B., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., [redacted] Clifton Terrace South, Apt. 408.

Weedon, Ava, 1306 W. Lexington St., Baltimore, Md.

Weglein, David E., Superintendent of Schools, Madison and Lafayette Aves., Baltimore, Md., 2400 Linden Ave.

Weidenhammer, Antoinette, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 213 Calhoun St.

Weigle, C. Lee, West Orange High School, West Orange, N. J., 106 Elm St., Orange, N. J.

Weinstein, Ruth, 3323 Ridge Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Weisenburg, Anna I., Liberty High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 538 Seneca St.

Wells, Laura M., Supervisor Intermediate Grades, Department of Education, Baltimore, Md., 4707 Edmondson Ave.

Wells, Mary B., Hartridge School, Plainfield, N. J., 1130 Thornton Ave.

Wendel, Hugo C. M., New York University, University Heights, New York City.

Wessel, H. M., Cheltenham Township High School, Oak Lane, Pa., 7205 Oak Ave.

Westermann, William Linn, Columbia University, New York City, 23 Donellan Road, Hartsdale, N. Y.

Westfall, Ralph R., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 8500 Fourth Ave.

White, Elizabeth B., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

White, Fred C., Morris High School, New York City, 470 E. 161 St.

White, Helen D., Germantown Friends School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 171 E. Walnut St.

Whitelaw, W. M., 710 Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City, 500 Riverside Drive.

Whitney, Cornelia, J. O. Wilson Normal School, Washington, D. C., Apt. 3, The Melles, 624 Maryland Ave., N. E.

Wiener, Katherine Marie, Frederick High School, Frederick, Md., 109 E. Patrick St.

Wilcox, Horace N., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 136 Hicks St.

Wilder, Charles W., Headmaster, Arnold School, Pittsburgh, Pa., 7505 Rosemary St.

Wildes, Harry Emerson, Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1527 N. Gratz St.

Wildes, Mrs. Helen J., William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Wildman, Catharine, Langhorne High School, Langhorne, Pa.

Wildman, Esther Theresa, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 140 N. Fifteenth St.

Wildman, Nathan, 2730 West York St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Wilkenson, Katherine May, Miss Chapin's School, 32 E. 57 St., New York City, 41 Central Park, West.

Williams, L. Louise, White Plains High School, White Plains, N. Y., 41 Church St.

Williamson, Mrs. Louise S., Wilson Ave. School, Newark, N. J., 615 Bangs Ave., Asbury Park, N. J.

Willis, Margaret, Constantinople Woman's College, Galata P. O., Box 39, Constantinople, Turkey.

Wilson, Ida Belle, Maryland State Normal School, Salisbury, Md., Pokomoke City, Md.

Wilson, Martin L., James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 77 Third St., Ridgefield Park, N. J.

Wing, Lucy Madeira (Mrs. David L.), Headmistress, Miss Madeira's School, 1339 Nineteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Winston, Adele W., Morris High School, New York City, 569 W. 150 St.

Winter, Miss Mary Arline, Reading High School, Reading, Pa., 562 Main St., Royersford, Pa.

Winters, Herbert D., Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

Witmer, M. Eleta, Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., Barclay Court, S. Pennsylvania Ave.

Wlodeck, Alwina H., Walton High School, New York City, 953 Anderson Ave.

Wolff, Mabel P., Phoebe Anna Thorne School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., Gulph Road.

Wolf, Morris, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 47 Sunshine Road, Upper Darby, Delaware Co., Pa.

Wombaugh, Jennie R., Olean High School, Olean, N. Y., 215 N. First St.

Wood, Elizabeth C., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 100 Morningside Drive.

Wood, Laura L., Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y., 432 Buffalo Ave., Paterson, N. J.

Woodward, Esther R., Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 125 New York Ave., N. W.

Woodworth, Carlos A., Principal, High School, West New York, N. J., 24 Monitor Place.

Worstell, Helen S., De Witt Clinton High School, New York City.

Wyckoff, Harriet Elvira, High School of Commerce, New York City, 512 W. 123 St.

Wyckoff, Vertrees Judson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 98 College Ave.

Xavier, Sister M., Mount St. Agnes College, Mt. Washington, Md.

Young, Helen L., Hunter College, New York City, 30 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Young, Julia A., Lucretia Mott School, Washington, D. C., 1911 Third St., N. W.

Zema, Demetrius B., Fordham University, Bronx, New York City.